



CHANGE OF MINISTRY. TO THE PEOPLE OF OLDHAM.

Bolt court, 18. June, 1833.

MY FRIENDS,

It is not about a mere party matter that I am now going to address you, but upon matters which concern the well-being of you during your lives, and of your children after you. It is not of a change of Ministry, in any party sense of the word; it is not a change which will have been produced by any court-intrigue or cabal; it is (if it take place) a change which will have been produced by the general feeling of the people of the whole kingdom, influenced by the soundest judgment, and by a sense of their own rights, and of the manifold wrongs that they have had to endure. I need hardly advise *you*, who have always shown so much sound discrimination, totally to disregard the appellations of *Tory* and of *Whig*. I hate all party appellations: I hate *Radical* as much as the other party-names; because nothing is more delusive than the use of these names. Nothing is more easy than for a man to call himself this, or to call himself that. Weak, indeed, are the people who place any reliance upon such appellations. But, unfortunately, they have too great an effect with a considerable part of the people; and, at the last election, many and many a man was chosen merely because he called himself "A REFORMER." Instead of insisting upon his pledging himself to take off taxes, *which was the chief thing that we wanted a reform for*, a great part

of the people were quite content with a man's calling himself "A REFORMER." Let us, therefore, disregard these *names*, and talk about things.

The King has a right to choose his servants; a right as complete as that of the people to choose their representatives; and the Lords have a right equal to either of the other two, to reject any measure sent to them by the House of Commons; and I shall, before I have done, show you that, if they had not this right at this moment, our situation would be most desperate, indeed. It is supposed that they will reject certain measures which the Ministers are sure to carry in the House of Commons; and, in case of such rejection, it is supposed that the Ministers will quit their places. It is supposed that, in the Lords, there is a majority of fifty against the Ministers, the only remedy for which is, the creating of peers in such numbers as to overpower this majority, the new peers being ready to vote with the Ministers. It must be very manifest to you, that it would be quite as well to abolish the House of Lords, at once as to do this. Therefore, we are to regard the thing as impossible.

The next thing to consider, then, is, the consequence of not making this increase to the peerage; and, that consequence certainly is, the turning out of the Ministers at no very distant day; for, whether this took place upon the particular measure of the Irish church or not, the Ministry *could not go on*, with such a majority against them. Now, then, the only question in which we are interested is this: *whether it would be for the good of the people for the Ministry to be dismissed*; and then will follow the question: *what ought to be our conduct with regard to this matter?*

The Whig faction put forward high claims to the *gratitude* of the people on account of their having brought in the Reform Bill, and caused it to be passed. In answer to this claim, we say, that it

does not exist; that they were compelled to bring it in, or to bring in some measure of reform; that they could not have come into power without promising to do it, and that they could not have stayed in power if they had not done it; that they did what they did very slowly and very reluctantly; that they gave what they gave very grudgingly; that, with the exception of abolishing the rotten boroughs, they made the bill as little as possible favourable to the rights of the people; that they showed every disposition to shuffle out of a great part of what they had done; and that, if they had not been held up to the mark by the formidable attitude of the people, they would, at last, have abandoned the bill altogether, and have kept their places, if the Tories would have consented to such a bargain.

We owe them, therefore, no gratitude on account of the passing of the Reform Bill. Now, what did we want the Reform Bill FOR? It certainly was, that it might do us some good; that it might better our situation; that it might cause us to be better off. And, how was it to do this? Why, by the lopping off of pensions, sinecures, grants, and other emoluments; by reducing unnecessary establishments; and by suffering us to keep our earnings instead of giving them to the tax-gatherer; and thereby to be enabled to live better, to have more and better victuals and drink, more and better clothes, better lodging; that we might be enabled to lead, in short, easier and happier lives. This was what *the people* wanted the Reform Bill for, and not for the gratification of any abstract or metaphysical whim. Now, then, has the Reform Bill brought us any of the things which we expected it to bring us? It certainly has not; and the Ministers tell us, that they have no intention that it shall. No taxes worth naming have been taken off: tradesmen and farmers are in a state of ruin, and their work-people pressed down to the earth. Two things only have we asked: taking off the house and window taxes and the half of the malt tax. This reformed Parliament, at the suggestion of the Minis-

try, have rejected them both. Nay, in the case of the malt tax, the House voted for the taking it off on the Friday; and, on the next Tuesday, upon the motion of the Minister himself, it voted that it would not take it off. By a vast majority it rejected the motion of the vote by ballot. On the motion of the Ministers, it passed a law for causing men to be tried in Ireland by military officers, instead of being tried by judges and juries. These Ministers have proposed to make us pay twenty millions of money to those who have held the negroes so long in slavery, in order to induce them to let the blacks be only a little more free than they now are; these same Ministers have proposed to make us pay another immense sum to be given to the Irish clergy because they cannot make the people pay tithes.

Now, these facts are wholly undeniable. No one thing have these Ministers done to better our lot; and, if they be suffered to proceed with their projects, they will have added forty millions to the national debt during this one session of Parliament. There were many persons who expected, though I did not, that this Ministry and Parliament would have taken off the tax from newspapers; would have repealed the Six Acts, which they so much condemned when these Ministers were out of office; would have abolished some, at least, of the unmerited pensions and sinecures; would have done something to lessen the burden of tithes: many persons thought that they would do these things, at the least. I never did; but I did not expect that these Ministers would hardly be brazen enough to refuse to take off the malt tax and the house and window taxes; still less did I suppose that they would have added forty millions to the national debt in the course of one session of Parliament; and, less than all the rest did I suppose, that the first thing done by the first reformed Parliament would be the establishing of red-coat courts of justice in Ireland.

Well, then, can any movement of the Lords make our situation worse? Is there any cause for us to "arm our-

selves for the fight," as the hireling writers call upon us to do, in order to keep these men in power, and to prevent this Parliament from being dissolved, as it assuredly would be if a change of the Ministry were to take place? To my ears the sound of the word WHIG is like that of the death-watch to the sick man; but, at any rate, is there anything in the word TORY to make me afraid of a dissolution of that House of Commons which passed the Irish red-coat court-of-justice bill; which voted that it would not take off the house and window taxes; which voted that we should not have the ballot; which voted off half the malt tax on Friday, and which voted it on again the next Tuesday? Is there anything in the sound of the word *Tory* to make me frightened out of my senses at the prospect of a dissolution of a House of Commons like this? Is there anything in that sound to make me tear my hair off my head, and to bite my own flesh, from rage at the mere idea of the King's being graciously pleased to send this House back to render account to its constituents? "*Tory*," indeed! Before they attempt to frighten us with the word *Tory*, let them tell us of something that it is possible for the Tories to do us, some disagreeable thing that the Whigs have not done, and are not still prepared to do: let them tell us of some good to us that the Whigs have done and that the Tories would not do. Or, rather, let them tell us of *any good* that the Whigs ever did to the people since the hated name was first heard in England: yet, the partisans of these wretched and perfidious Whigs would fain persuade us, that we ought to fight, that we ought to rebel, that we ought to devote ourselves to destruction, rather than suffer a change of this Ministry, and run the risk of losing this reformed and precious House of Commons; seeming to forget, always, that a dissolution of Parliament does not *kill* the members. The word *dissolution* being frequently applied to that state of things in which the body is separated from the soul; some persons seem to imagine,

that a dissolution of the reformed House implies the physical death of the "*reform*" members; and, the rage against the Lords, amongst certain persons, is such, that one would almost imagine this opinion to be entertained by the "*reform*" members themselves. Begging their worships' pardon, I must, with all the respect that I have for them, observe, under correction, that the word means no such a thing: it merely means, their being told by the King, that they are no longer members of Parliament; and that they cannot be such again, until some body of persons duly authorised for the purpose, shall have given them authority to be such. Why, then, be in such a rage? It is only going again to an election; to be applauded to the skies; to receive the thanks and the blessings of their constituents; to be carried in a chair decorated with ribands; to be toasted and boasted and dined till they can hardly breathe: and though this is a good deal to be undergone by men so modest and so abstemious, still it does not kill, and might be borne without such a deal of rage against the Lords.

The *Times* and the *Chronicle* are the desperate partisans of this Whig Ministry. You know that the "*True Sun*" has been prosecuted by these present law-officers. I am now going to show you what these two papers have been saying, within these few days, relative to the Royal Family and the Lords. The "*True Sun*" has been prosecuted for endeavouring to bring the House of Commons into contempt. I will now, then, state to you, in substance, what these two papers have been saying; how they have dealt by the Royal Family and the Lords, because it is supposed that they intend to turn out the Whig Ministry. At the end of this letter I will insert all the articles entire, word for word, from these papers; and I request you to read them all through with attention; and if you find that they be not prosecuted by the law-officers of the crown, you will be well able to form your judgment as to that matter. The reading of these papers will amuse you, and I beg you to observe, that

they come from the partisans of the Whig Ministers. These papers, as you will see, say, "that there are certain branches of an *illustrious family*, both *legitimate* and *illegitimate*, who are canvassing to turn out the Ministers; that the court even is said to be *insincere*; that the Royal Family ought to read the history of the reign of *Charles the First*; that a *bill* will probably soon pass the Commons, to *turn the bishops out of the House of Lords*; that an *address* may go from the Commons to remove the *DUKE of CUMBERLAND* from the court and the King; that even *greater personages* than these, male or female, ought not to suppose that the people of England will submit, without *enforcing retribution* from the authors of the dangers which impend; that the people ought to *buckle on their armour for the fight*; that the Tories meditate a direct war upon the nation by *bayonet* and *sabre*; that the House of Commons ought to pass resolutions, that the Tory leaders be banished from the presence of the King; that it ought to have a *bill ready for disbanding the Guards, and the whole of the army now at home*; that the bishops are an *insane* body, who hang upon the Tory peers, in defending non-residence, maintaining pluralities, perpetuating tithes and church-rates; and an *unnecessary band of ecclesiastical drones*; that the political unions would act a false part, but would be overpowered by the *reformed constituency*; that the examples of *Charles I.*, and *Louis XVI.* ought not to be lost on the court of *St. James*; that certain members of the Royal Family have an *irretrievable reputation*; that there is an *unavoidable suspicion*, that the King himself is not, in his heart, *beyond a small fraction, Whig*; that the House of Lords is the *great deposit of corruption and public robbery*; that Toryism and terrorism are equally *bastard weapons of sovereign power*, and that *bastards enough* could be found to wield them both; that the Radicals wish the two Houses to quarrel; that the Tories dare not dis-

solve the House of Commons; that the Lords, who are opposed to the Whigs, are a set of hungry and *reckless paupers*, raised to the peerage by *PITT and CASTLEREAGH*."

This is a pretty good specimen of Whig modesty, patriotism, and loyalty; and it is sufficient to show that these writers are duly qualified to censure "DESTRUCTIVES," as they call us, for what they call our revolutionary views. I have observed before on the modesty of the Whigs in entertaining a hope that the PEOPLE will bestir themselves, and even arm themselves, to prevent them from being put out of place. If there were only one single town in the kingdom to discover a wish to keep them in power, the very existence of such town would cover the whole kingdom with infamy. Besides the above abuse, these writers tell us, that *all our present* difficulties were created by the Tories: "that the Tories made the national debt;" that the Tories "persecuted reformers." With regard to the difficulties and the national debt, they arose out of the French war; and that war was occasioned by the famous Whigs, Lord SPENCER (father of Lord ALTHORP), Lord FITZWILLIAM, and the late Duke of PORTLAND. These three men, aided by the pen of the old hack, BURKE, forced PITT into the war of 1793, and joined him in carrying the war on. One of them became First Lord of the Admiralty; another, Secretary of State; and the other Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. Two of them are dead, but the father of Lord ALTHORP is alive. I say, that they forced PITT into that war. And, therefore, this is a false charge against the Tories, at any rate. Besides this, it is notorious that the Whigs made the national debt in the first place, and made it for the purpose of keeping the people of England in subjection. It is also notorious, that the Whigs PASSED THE SEPTENNIAL BILL, and, that the Whigs have uniformly opposed the repeal of it. Then again, as to "persecuting reformers." Are those reformers whom the Whigs have put into jail in such numbers for sending forth cheap publications, or are

they "*conservatives*," or what are they? Speaking for *myself*, though something of a reformer, too, I will not say, that they persecuted me: for I made it a persecution of themselves. However, I was at the time when they prosecuted me, doing my best to cause the Reform Bill to pass; and, every one but myself, wondered what could be their reason for prosecuting me! I did not wonder. I knew their motive well; but, at any rate, here is a pretty good answer to the charge, "that the Tories persecuted the reformers;" to which, however, might be added, the question, whether the "*True Sun*" is not a "reformer," and whether that paper is not *now* under prosecution by them?

These writers tell us, that the *Tories*, in order to "*cajole and deceive the people*," intend, if they supplant the Whigs, to *take off the malt tax and house and window taxes!* Do they, indeed! *Egad*, we will have them, then! These are the very things which we wanted the reform for; other things, to be sure: but, let them begin with them, and we will give them time. I, for my own part, most explicitly and positively stipulate, that, if they will take off these taxes, and repeal STURGES BOURNE'S bills and the Septennial Bill, and send the poor-law commissioners, all but the two bishops, to crack stones by the highway, or dig gravel, or scribble philosophical essays in their garrets (and this last I am pretty sure they would gladly do); I positively stipulate, that, if they will do these things, I, for my part, will very quietly give them time to do more. It is not so much our business to know what persons they employ or give money to, as it is for us to take care that they do not take away too much of our money. They cannot alter everything at once; and if they will but begin, by doing that which the Whigs tell us they will not do, I shall be satisfied. I do not care whether it be "*cajology*" or not: nor will you care. You will find it a very good sort of "*cajology*" that will give you a pot of strong ale for twopence instead of sixpence or sevenpence; a pleasant sort of "*cajology*" that will leave six or seven pounds

a year in your pocket, instead of its being taken away from you by the assessed tax-gatherer. If this be the Tory manner of "*cajology*," give me the *cajology*, and the Tories along with it.

I shall now turn from these diurnal hacks to something of more lofty origin. A few days ago, there was a debate in the House of Commons on the affairs of PORTUGAL. You will recollect, that the Lords had outvoted the Ministers upon an address to the King; and that this proceeding in the House of Commons was instituted to express an opinion on that matter different from the opinion of the Lords. You will also recollect, that it was then a prevalent opinion, that the Lords had formed a determination to oust this Ministry. During that debate, some very curious and rather strange things were said, of which I shall particularly notice only the following passage from the speech of Lord JOHN RUSSELL, which I take from the report contained in the *Times* newspaper of the 7. of this month of June. He alludes to certain measures which he had, in order to avoid a collision with the Lords, refrained from urging forward. These measures, though not actually named, every reader will perceive to have been, the SHORTENING OF PARLIAMENTS AND THE BALLOT, and now let us hear what the *Times* reports him to have said upon the subject.

"He denied that in doing so they "would be seeking to provoke a collision with the House of Lords. His (Lord J's) object—the same had been the object of all his colleagues, *but he had been more prominently forward in regard to the measures to which he was about to refer*—in all his former conduct had been to prevent a chance of such a collision, and if in certain measures he had confined himself within certain restrictions—if he had *abstained from pressing forward opinions which were deeply-seated in his breast*,—if he had abstained in that instance from carrying into effect views and opinions which, the more he considered them, *the more he was convinced of their being most essential*

"to the happiness, prosperity, and welfare of this country, let the House, let the hon. Gentleman, be assured that he did not decline then urging those views in consequence of any change that had taken place in his opinions, or in consequence of any wish to preserve office or place, but because he saw there was no chance of the carrying of them into effect without bringing into collision the two branches of the legislature—a result which he thought they should not wantonly bring on (loud cheers from the ministerial benches, responded to by similar cheers from the opposition); and for the bringing on of which any men who ever took office in this country would be most deeply responsible. (Cries of Hear, hear). Those were the reasons that, in that instance, had guided his conduct and that of his Majesty's Ministers."

Now, my friends, "*cajolery*" here or "*cajolery*" there, this means neither more nor less than that he would have brought forward measures essential to the happiness and welfare of the country, if he had not seen that there was no chance of the Lords suffering such measures to pass. Whether this be a very high compliment to himself, as a representative of the people, I will not say: I will offer no opinion upon that point; but (if his speech be correctly reported, which I by no means vouch for), here is certainly no very high compliment to the House of Lords. There is quite matter enough for us to muse upon, even if we were to stop here. What! *refrain from doing things essential to the happiness and welfare of the country*; refrain from doing these, lest he should bring on a dispute with the Lords! Quite matter enough to muse upon here; and, perhaps, it would take a great many volumes of very decent republicanism to bring men's minds to a conclusion more decided than that to which the mind of man must be brought by this one single sentence. All the raving rubbish of the *Times* and the *Chronicle* weigh not as a feather, compared with the contents of this one sentence, coming from the lips of the son

of a Duke. "What!" will the people of Devonshire exclaim, "there was something ESSENTIAL to our happiness, prosperity, and welfare; and our representative says, that he refrained from proposing it, lest it should produce a dispute with the Lords!"

I am not going to dispute the facts, nor am I going to inquire into the extent of the virtue that could enable a man thus to refrain. It is the extensive INFERENCE that I have to deal with at present; and, certainly, some men might infer from this, that all the things that the Whigs have done, and all that they have left undone, in opposition to the wishes of the people; that all our disappointments; that every thing that we complain of at their hands; that every thing that we accuse them of; that every ground of charge; that every subject of our complaint against them, *we ought to ascribe to the Lords, and not to the Ministers and House of Commons.* That it was the Lords, the Tory Lords, that wrote the speech for the opening of the Parliament; that the Tory Lords it was who refused to repeal the house and window taxes, and who rescinded the vote relative to the malt tax! What a pity it was, that Lord JOHN and his colleagues did not make their stand THERE! and not wait for the "*Church of Ireland Temporalities Bill*," about which the people either care not a straw; or, if they think it worth their while to understand it, look upon it as a mere delusion, giving to the people of Ireland no relief whatsoever, and, in some respects, actually doing them harm. To make their stand here is the weakest thing ever thought of by mortal men. In this whole kingdom there is not a man of sense, and of independence at the same time, who will care a straw about the rejection of this measure; while I, who have had an opportunity of knowing what it is, and of seeing how it will operate, declare it to be my conviction, that the tendency of it will be to check the progress of all real and useful reforms in the established church of England and Ireland united; that it

is a real piece of cajolery ; and that its direct and natural tendency is, not to reform any abuse, but to perpetuate abuse till, at last, there will be no remedy but that of violence. If, indeed, the Ministers had passed a bill for the repeal of the malt tax, the house and window taxes, the legacy and probate duties, or of the Septennial Act ; and if the Lords had *then* out-voted them ; in that case, the Ministers might have appealed to the *people* ; they might then have safely made that appeal ; but now their appealing to the people is like howling to the winds ; and, as to their attempt to terrify the Lords with the projects of the radicals, the Lords must be fools, indeed, if they still believe, that the projects of the radicals are the most dangerous to them.

If the Lords were wise, "wise in their generation," they would see this : that their danger arises from the very class that set up an outcry against the Radicals. The further men are removed from them, the less envy they have of them ; that it is not the artisan and the labourer that look with an eye of envy on the Lord's town-house, and on his country mansion and park ; but the money-monger in the town, and the great swelled-up bull-frog farmer in the country. I have known, for many years, and have been a strict observer of all classes of men in this country ; and I have never heard amongst common tradesmen, little farmers, artisans, or labourers, any thing indicating a wish to see the nobility pulled down ; but, amongst those ; amongst the *parvenus*, as the French call them, I have seen one portion aiming at getting to the height of the nobility, and have seen those who despair of ever doing that, always trying to pull them down. The *Liberals*, or those that the French call *Doctrinaires*, a race, whom I hate (oh, God, how I hate them !), are always talking in the same strain ; one of their sayings being, "that men are not born legislators." Why, to be sure, they are not ; but that is not the question : the question, and the only question, is, whether such an institution be, taking the defects along with the

advantages, for the good of the people amongst whom it exists ? For ourselves, we know that our country has enjoyed a greater degree of greatness, of good living, of easy and happy life, for a greater number of years than any other country in the world ; and we know besides, that this institution has been in existence all the while. This is no reason why its abuses should not be corrected, why its encroachments should not be put an end to ; but it is a reason, and a sufficient reason, for restraining us from condemning the institution altogether. The sufferings of this industrious people are not the natural fruit of its ancient institutions ; but the natural fruit of the abuse of them. Whether they can be peaceably restored to their pristine purity, I know not ; but this I know, that, if they be not so restored peaceably, they must be restored in some other manner, in spite of all the charges of revolutionist heaped upon him who would restore them.

I am for annual Parliaments, and universal suffrage, the question of the ballot always having been a matter of comparative insignificance with me, being quite sure, that it would soon be found to be of very little real utility, and to be a mere matter of convenience at the taking of an election. "*Universal suffrage!*" have the Lords exclaimed, and then have gone on to say, that neither ranks nor estates could exist for a year. Never was there a greater error than this. The "*REFORM CONSTITUENCY*," as the *Times* and *Chronicle* call it, is precisely the thing to pull down the nobles. It must produce, if it continue for any length of time, an untitled aristocracy of wealth, and particularly wealth consisting of mere money. This is inevitable, especially while thirty millions a year are raised in the country to be given to mere money holders. It is precisely amongst this species of constituency, that you find all the real and settled enemies of the House of Lords. The working people, the common tradesmen and farmers, have none of the envies that bother the brains of this moneyed tribe : the change that they want is a change from bad living to

living : a single thought about a change of the constituent parts of the state, has never, even by accident, come athwart their minds : they take the country as they found it with respect to matters of government ; and if they have the means of leading those happy lives, to which their virtues and their industry entitle them, I defy all the *feelosofers* and *liberals* that the devil ever sent upon earth, to persuade them that there ought not to be Lords, or that there ought to be any change at all in the Government. If I were a Lord, I would get universal suffrage as soon as I could ; *coute qui coute*, I would, if I had the power, make the industrious and working part of the people well off. I would not care about *Regent-street*, or *Pall-Mall-East*, or *Strand-West*, or *Pimlico Palace*, or any of its gate-ways. I would make the millions well off, let what would become of the thousands. Industry in the tradesman should bring the joint of meat upon the table, and in the labourer, it should bring the bit of bacon upon his board, and the Sunday-coat upon his back, as his grandfather had them.

Infinite pains have been taken, by those who really would destroy the Lords, to persuade them that the working people are their enemies. There never was more gross delusion than the belief of this. A little reflection will tell you that it must be so ; but that it is so, I know well. It is just the same with regard to the established church. It is your lovers of order, your education men, your liberals, your "moral-restraint" gentlemen, who are the real pullers down of the church, and who represent it as a monster amongst legitimate institutions. Of itself, and cleared of all abuses, there is nothing more reasonable, nothing more just, than an established or national church. For, what is it ? It is an establishment for the teaching of religion, for marrying the people, for baptizing those who are born and recording their births, and for the burying of those who die. It is, in fact, all these things furnished by those who own the houses and the land, for the use of those who

have neither houses nor land. The church with all these services belonging to it, constitute a great right of the people whether they have property or not : the poor claim their share of it at the hands of the rich : this share is theirs *by law*.

Clear as all this is to the plain understanding of every man, so enormous have been the abuses and the neglects, that even the poor themselves look upon the existence of the church as an oppression, and seem to wish this their share and their right to be taken from them. So great has been the negligence of the clergy ; so flagrant the abuse of non-residence and pluralities ; so much oftener have the working people seen the parson with the sword of justice, than with the Bible in his hand, that they seem to have lost all sense of their rights in this respect, and seem eager to have taken from them that share which the law has given them. Fine state of things for the *Doctrinaires* to revel in ! And, indeed, to such a pass things are come, that it does seem next to impossible that this whole fabric should not now go to pieces ; it does seem impossible that the church-religion should continue much longer to be practised, except upon the footing on which it stands in the United States of America. At two different times in my life, I have written on the dangers which threatened this church. The first time in 1805, an essay, in the *Register*, describing the causes which were at work, tending to overturn the establishment, and predicting, that Sir WILLIAM SCOTT'S Bill of 1802, if not counteracted by some other Act of Parliament, for putting a stop to pluralities and non-residence, must, in comparatively a few years, effect the complete overthrow of the church. The other essay, in 1817, entitled "*A Call upon the Clergy*." I called upon them to *join the reformers*, instead of endeavouring, as they were then doing, to hunt them from the face of the earth. I told them, that the millions were their natural allies ; that the money-monger aristocracy were their natural enemies ; that, in a struggle between them and the money-mon-

gers, which must come, at last, they must be thrown overboard; and that, then, when too late, they would appeal to the millions to help them! I had not thought of this passage, for ten years, I dare say, when it was called back to my mind upon my first hearing the proposition to cast ten Irish bishops overboard.

Let the Lords take warning from the fate of the clergy. The money-mongers are now preparing to cast them overboard; and they have no earthly defence, but in the good will of the *common people*; and the farther these are from them in point of wealth, the more safely may they rely upon their friendship. Who is so blind as not to see, that the infernal phalanx of money has been casting its eyes all around it to see on what it shall first lay its claws? The "*respectable constituency*" has begun, by handing over a part of the church of Ireland: only a little gentle bite: a mere snack to begin with. *L'appétit vient en mangeant*; or, as we say, eating is like scratching, only wanting a beginning. This little snack will give a relish for a full meal; and now the money-monster is casting its greedy Jew-eyes over the whole of the church of England. I know not what scheme; but, in the end, directly or indirectly, the scheme, be it what it may, will tend to transfer the wealth of the church and the patrimony of the poor into the hands of the monstrous money-monger. Having that in his maw, there will remain nothing but the estates of the nobles; and here is a "*reformed constituency*," precisely calculated to hand those over also to the monster. When Lord DURHAM was boasting that there was no fear of demagogues being elected in the Metropolitan boroughs, he stated, as the grounds of his boast, that there were *seventy-three thousand* fundholders living in the city and in those boroughs; and that, therefore, they would take care not to *endanger property* by their votes. No, my lord, not *funded* property, if they could help it; not *their claim upon your estate*; not *endanger that*, I will warrant them, if they could help it.

Ah, my lord! if you had seen the matter in its right light, you would have looked, as far as these boroughs went, to those whom you call the rabble, who have no claim upon your estate, who envy you neither your park nor your coal-mines, and who would rather sit upon a brick-floor and drink a pot of beer, than sit in your parlour and drink your claret.

It is clear as day-light, that the struggle between these landed estates and the funds, has been going on for several years: the common people will naturally take part with that side from which they receive hostility the least visible. With rank and authority they come in contact: they see nothing but these: these compel them to give up their earnings to satisfy the money-monster, who excites no anger in their breasts, because they do not see him, and hardly know of his existence. Oh! how the Lords laboured to get a more "*respectable constituency*!" and, if they do not soon change their course, how bitterly will they and their posterity repent of it! They proposed to have, at least, a *twenty-pound constituency*. A *ten-pound* one has shown them pretty well what it can do: a *twenty-pound* one would have done the work in half the time. They would have been literally the representatives of the thirty millions a year that go into the pockets of the fundholders.

One thing, and with the mention of that I shall conclude; one thing the Lords ought to be assured of; and that is, that the millions will, in this case, as in all former cases, be sure to triumph in the end; for instance, if the *legal-tender paper-money* were to terminate in *assignats*, then all is at the mercy of the millions. Oh, were I a Lord, would I call for the putting down of political unions! Just the contrary would be my course: it is the union in *Thread-needle-street* that I should be afraid of; and the existence of that union I should always think inconsistent with the safety of my title and estate. The present Ministry are pretty nearly *Doctrinaires*; and a *Doctrinaire* is never at rest while there is anything in existence that is more than a twelvemonth

old. He is everlastingly talking of the "improvements of the age," and the "march of intellect"; and about "institutions keeping pace with the age." He has a great hatred of "prejudices" and of "nationality": for free-trade in every thing else, he is for free trade in national likings and even in allegiance. Anything having existed in former times is, with him, *prima facie* evidence that it ought not to exist now. Above all things, he is distinguished for his disregard and contempt for provender for the belly and the back; except his *own* belly and his *own* back, which he is very willing to furnish out of the labour of those whom he dooms to live upon water-porridge or potatoes, being, however, always ready to afford them ample supply of *food for their minds* out of his inexhaustible storehouse of "useful knowledge," and of "penny magazines"! It is a curious fact, that, within these four or five years, no less than four *corn-mills* in the neighbourhood of UXBRIDGE, and several in the neighbourhood of MAIDSTONE, have been turned into *paper-mills*! One would think, that the poor souls had actually taken to eating the books. What a fine prospect for the *Doctrinaires*!

However, it is no joke; it is a serious fact, that these wretched *Doctrinaires* do really endeavour to persuade the working-people, that it is consonant with reason, and particularly with religion, that they should be content to labour incessantly and to receive as reward hunger and rags. I trust, my friends of OLDHAM, that not one amongst you is capable of being thus deluded and cheated; that you are not to be cajoled by the sound of "*liberal Government*" and "*liberal Ministry*," and "*reformed constituency*," and "*reformed Parliament*"; but, that you will judge from their acts; that, if they lighten your burdens, you will praise them; that, if they do not, you will condemn them; and that you will use every lawful means in your power to support me and my excellent colleague, in our endeavours to discharge our duty

with effect. In the full assurance that you will thus act,

I remain,
your faithful friend,
and most obedient servant,
WM. COBBETT.

P. S. Upon this same subject of change of Ministry, will be found, a little further on, **FOUR LETTERS**, which, since the last *Register*, have been published in the *True Sun* newspaper. You will now turn to those letters; and when you have read them, it will be quite unnecessary for me to address you further on the subject. You will understand it all full as well as I; and, understanding it, you will know how to act.

STEAM-BOAT JOB.

GENERAL REGISTRY BILL.

LOCAL COURTS BILL.

IMPRISONMENT-FOR-DEBT BILL.

ABOLITION OF TRIAL BY JURY.

POOR-LAW COMMISSION.

THE public in general are so much and so properly occupied with matters connected with the burdens that they have to bear, that they do not, and, indeed, cannot bestow sufficient attention upon the matters placed at the head of this paper, and divers other matters, tending to introduce Austrian government into England. The House of Commons did two good things yesterday, by demolishing two Whig projects; the one for giving a monopoly of the exclusive use of St. George's Channel to a cormorant Steam-boat Company, which would have been much about the same thing in effect, (as was very well observed by a member of the House) as establishing a corporate company for the running of coaches to and from BRIGHTON, and enabling that company utterly to destroy all competition upon the road. The other good thing that it did, and a thing of prodigious importance, was throwing out the **GENERAL REGISTRY BILL**. This bill formed a great feature in the BROUGHAM "law

reforms," which, if carried into full effect, would be a total abolition of the laws of England.

This bill provided for the erecting of an immense building in London, for the keeping of every man's title-deeds in England and Wales. So that every man who had a farm, or even a cottage, or a little bit of land, or a house of any size, would have been compelled to bring his title-deeds to this place; if he had a mortgage on his premises, it would have been recorded, too; all wills relating to real property must have come to the same shop; an account of every settlement, rent-charge, or other lien upon his property, must have been recorded here; and, to this place, any man might have gone at any time, and seen the condition of every man's property! What a fine instrument in the hands of the Government! They would, at any time, have been able to ascertain every thing relating to any man's pecuniary circumstances, if that man was possessed of real property. There would, have been no possibility of preventing malignant neighbours from prying into the whole of a man's affairs; and all this under the pretence of protecting purchasers against fraudulent vendors: when Mr. TOOKE told us, that he, in thirty years' practice, in the conveying of estates, had never known one single instance of a real fraud of this description. Here was to have been an immense swarm of placemen appointed to manage the affairs and superintend this building; and, if by any act of negligence, ignorance, or any thing else on the part of this swarm of persons, any estate-owner suffered an injury, he was to receive compensation *out of the consolidated fund*! That is to say, out of the fruit of the industry of the people. Lord ALTHORP disclaimed it as a cabinet measure; *but every soul on the treasury bench voted for it.* Mr. William Brougham moved the second reading of the bill. The opposers of it endeavoured to prevail upon him to take the second reading in quiet, and to let further proceedings with regard to it, go off, till the next session. He would not consent; and, therefore, they demolish-

ed it at once by a majority of *eighty-two* against a minority of *sixty-nine*, though the treasury bench voted for it to a man. This was a cruel cut. It is said, that the swarms of officers to superintend this affair, were *already nominated*! What a disappointment: new carriages and new clothes I'll warrant it; and the mouths set to the scale of turtle and venison. What a shoal thus flung upon the beach, without the smallest prospect of a tide to take them off!

"LOCAL COURTS BILL." The great mass of the people have very little idea of what this project really is. The Whig cry is, "*that it will render law cheap to the poor man.*" It will take the poor man's bed from under him in the speediest and most unrelenting manner. It provides one local judge, at least, for every county; and, as far as I can gather (the bill being yet in the Lords), it will go pretty nearly, if not quite, to dispense with the trial by jury. The *Morning Chronicle* of to-day, in answering a correspondent, has the following passage, to which I beg the reader's attention.

It is, no doubt, impossible to decide law-suits without inconvenience to the community at large. "In the questions concerning cheap justice (says our contemporary), it is often forgotten, that, however cheaply a suit may be determined between the litigating parties, it must often be a great inconvenience to others. We may get rid of jurors, but it must generally be necessary to have witnesses, most of whom are, to a certain degree, inconvenienced by the demand on their time and attention; so that, in order to settle a dispute between A and B, two ill-conditioned persons who ought never to have raised it, it is often necessary to inconvenience a dozen other letters of the alphabet." Juries; no doubt, may be got rid of, and ought to be got rid of, in the local tribunal, as a cumbrous and troublesome piece of machinery, for which, in the superior courts, the only argument is, that in cases between the Government and individuals, they are not so liable to be biased as judges. In all other cases, a judge is to be presumed a better instrument than a juror; and we find, that in the Irish Assistant Barristers' Courts, the people having the plea, have the good sense to prefer a barrister to a jury. With respect to the inconvenience of witnesses, which cannot be got rid of, there can be no reason why rich men should have the power of subjecting others to

inconvenience any more than poor men. The poverty or wealth of the claimant can afford no test as to litigiousness. Besides, it is to be kept in mind that witnesses are generally of the class of the claimants. In a dispute respecting a bargain for a cow or pig, or a contract for a trifling amount, the witnesses are generally also humble, and the inconvenience is not greater to them than it is to one of a superior class, called in a suit for a larger sum.

I have no time to do anything more now than just point this thing out to my readers. The man who writes in this *Chronicle*, has been, for several years, decrying, and endeavouring to destroy, the institution of trial by jury. At every turn he has been carping at this mode of trial; and these local tribunals as he calls them are, doubtless, intended to give this institution its death-blow. Only think of fifty or a hundred judges, always residing upon the spot where they are to administer justice, consisting of underling scribes of whig lawyers, dining and drinking with the parties who have got anything to give them to dine upon and to drink! They will be, and they must be, bribed. It is notorious that they are in France. Partiality and bribes must prevail; and, when such are the means of prevailing, what chance has the *poor man* to have? This job is to give cheap law to the poor man, it is said. The poor man never brings actions: actions enough would be brought against him, only they are so expensive. With regard to the country labourers, this is the case: their low wages and perishing poverty have made them all debtors to the chandler's shop. Perhaps, take England through, they owe three or four weeks' wages to the chandler's shop. To bring our *action* against them would answer no purpose: the first movements would cost more than the sums due; but, pass this measure, their beds are taken from under them in a week, their pigs are taken from their sties; they are left upon the bare floor, or are turned into the lane. It is the most damned invention for oppressing the poor man, that ever found its way from the heart, even of a Scotch "*feelosofer*." If the Lords do not throw out this bill, before they have done with it, they will

show themselves to be that which I will not describe.

POOR-LAW COMMISSION. This is another branch of the same grand project for reducing the country to a species of Austrian government. The plan is, to have *hired* justices of the peace, or judges, stationed all over the country, under pretence of "making property more secure," and "giving cheap law to the poor man." The poor man very seldom wants any law, except for the recovery of wages; and there the law authorises the justices of the peace to decide upon his claims. But the plan is, to have not only justices, but a police all over the country appointed by the Government: to destroy entirely the county governments, the parochial governments, and all those things which kept the direct powers of the Government of the country at so great a distance. The plan is; in short, the Whig plan is, to supplant the ancient English government by this sort of Austrian government. The poor-law commission have appointed a parcel of itinerant collectors of information; and a book has been laid before Parliament, containing extracts from this information. It is impossible to read that book without being convinced that the main object of the whole thing is, to get an establishment of hired justices, and of a half-military police, setting aside the present justices of the peace, and all the peace-officers of the country; to send men in half-uniform, the men themselves being half foreigners, to all the country towns and villages. The people of HORSHAM, in Sussex, having read, in this book, a most false and calumnious account of their situation and their conduct, presented a petition the other day to the House of Commons, through the hands of their member, Mr. HURST, complaining of this account; and through the means of Mr. HURST and Mr. GORING, a very complete exposure took place. In all probability, this scheme will be blown into air; and if it be, we shall be greatly indebted to these gentlemen, and to the spirited, sensible, and virtuous county of Sussex, in which, though there was what was called a

riot in every parish in the county; that is to say, that there was a rising in every parish to demand an advance of wages, there was not a single act of *violence*, a single injury done to the person of any one human being; and it is only doing justice to the rich part of the people of that county, to say, that the instances were very rare when they were vindictive enough to seek the rigid execution of the law on the offenders. In that county, and in Kent and Surrey, the proprietors and the magistrates appear to have had the good sense and the justice to endeavour to make the working people well off, and to have determined to rule by securing willing submission to the law, instead of seeking to rule by coercion; and, it is very curious that, while all is peace and harmony in these counties, these counties are particularly picked out as those which stand most in need of *hired* justices, hired overseers, and a half-military police; and all that goodness and kind consideration of the magistrates and the employers are, by these poor-law runners, ascribed to "INTIMIDATION." Anything more hellish than this never came from the pen or tongue of mortal man. I am sure, that all these whig schemes will be blown into air: if they were not, one half of the nation would soon be set to watch and dodge, and live upon the other half. Englishmen would be a set of slaves, constantly under *surveillance* of spies, and hourly subjected to be knocked about like dogs, or to be crammed into dungeons. Such a scheme can never succeed; and, above all the rest of mankind, it becomes those who own the land, at once to set their faces against the diabolical design.

WHIG SPITE.

READER, did you ever see the picture which represents the famous English Saint, SAINT DUNSTON, whose name has been retained in our kalendar, and in a parish, bearing whose name, I am now writing this; did you ever see the picture representing this famous

Saint taking the devil by the nose with a pair of red-hot tongs; did you ever pay attention to the writhings and twistings of the father of lies; to the glare and rolling of his eyes; to the foam issuing from his distended jaws; to the livid flames going forth mixed with the foam? If you never did, imagine him now to live in *Downing Street*, and the good old Saint there to have him by the nose; and then read in the *Morning Chronicle* of to-day, his words upon the occasion, manifestly edited by a *noisy UNDERSTRAPPER*, who is trembling for his *seat*, as well as for his *pay*: and here the words are:

"Mr. Cobbett *explained* last night in another epistle, and vehemently abjures all alliance with the Tories; but avows that he will approve and support 'any body' for a whole year, at the least, 'who will take off the malt tax and the house and window taxes—who will repeal the Whig Septennial Act—who will repeal Sturges Bourne's bills, and drive all the *Malthusian* devils back to their native hell.' He further liberally says, that he will give *time* for doing other things to any Ministry or Parliament who would do these commendable deeds. Mr. Cobbett is extremely liberal, and we would recommend him immediately to open a negotiation with the Carlton Club. But he must be extremely credulous, if he really fancies that a Tory cabinet will gratify his wishes in these respects. Indeed Mr. Cobbett knows better, and is only putting a little salt on the tails of the Tories in order to catch them. We have no doubt that the Conservatives will go very far to get back into office. Their recent coalition in Staffordshire with the *currency political unionists* proves their chameleon nature, but they are notwithstanding little likely to give or redeem such pledges as Mr. Cobbett exacts. Mr. Cobbett's abuse is *extremely harmless* and consistent with his well-known habits of vituperation. We only regret that it is *not now* accompanied with the usual portion of sense and spirit which redeem his personalities. But the fact is, that Mr. Cobbett has committed a capital blunder. He should have *kept out* of Parliament, and has entered it *too late*. As an orator he *gives the system an occasional blow in a soft place*; but the reformed House of Commons is not his proper theatre, and what the country gains by his speeches it loses in the *Register*. Moreover, *Marplot* never yet succeeded in the long run. He ought to have taken a *lesson from the fate of Mr. Hunt*, who, with his cunning, was instantly seen through when he began to fight the battle of the Tories under radical colours."

Not another word: this, as Dr. MIL-

NER entitles his last book, is, "the end of controversy."

I am, Sir,

Your most obedient servant,
WM. COBBETT.

COBBETT'S

FRENCH AND ENGLISH DICTIONARY.

OUT of the very house, and, perhaps, the very room, that Dr. JOHNSON sent his *Dictionary*, I am this day sending the last part of this work to the press; and, therefore, I can promise, that it will be published in the last week of the month of *July*.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TRUE SUN.

(From the *True Sun* of 15. instant.)

SIR,—The *Times* and the *Chronicle*, seeing the probable fate of their patrons, the Whig Ministry, are crying aloud; are menacing the Lords with the *vengeance of the people*; and they even go so far as to threaten that this Ministry will DISBAND THE ARMY! Now, Sir, if I had written thus, or if you had written thus, against the Whigs, how soon would those liberty-loving gentry have had us laid by the heels!

But, Sir, as to the matter. Are these writers stupid enough to imagine that there is *one* single, sensible, and *independent* man in all England, Ireland, or Scotland, who could feel displeased with the Lords for being the cause of turning out this Ministry! What, Sir, when all the great towns are petitioning the King to turn them out! At a meeting of the county of Surrey, no very many months ago, *mine was the only hand* held up against a resolution expressing confidence in this Ministry. At a recent meeting of that same county, *not one single hand* was held up, expressing a want of confidence in them, and expressing a desire that they should be turned out! Want of leisure, and want of means of assembling, is the only reason why all the towns and villages have not backed the great towns in a prayer that they may be turned out. And do these scribbling creatures imagine that they can rouse the country to a hatred of the Lords for giving effect to its own prayers.

Look, Sir, at the mass of measures that these men have brought into the House of Commons: a bare look at this mass, making part of a revolution at every step, and yet doing nothing to give the people the smallest degree of relief or satisfaction; plunging

everything into confusion, taking all to pieces, and putting nothing together again; unsettling the minds of the people as to everything established, taking care, however, to correct no abuse; exhibiting an inveterate attachment to corruption of every description: breaking asunder all the ligatures of society, and promising nothing that shall give the people cause of content, or that shall promise peace or security for the future.

Why, Sir, were there nothing but this picture for us to look at, it would be the bounden duty of the Peers to interfere at once, in a constitutional manner, to arrest their progress, which, it suffered to go on, must inevitably end in their own ruin and in that of the people along with them. From this Ministry the people have received nothing but disappointment; every man has made up his mind that no good can come from them; and I take upon me to assert (having as good an opportunity of knowing the fact as any man in the kingdom), that to turn out this Ministry, (seeing *another turn-out*, which would be the natural consequence of it), would go very far towards reconciling the people to that House which some of the Whigs have had the audacity to represent as not being so very necessary to insure the well-being of the people.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,
WM. COBBETT.

London, June 15, 1833.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TRUE SUN.

(From the *True Sun* of 17. instant.)

SIR,—In my letter, which appeared in your paper on Saturday last, I am, by mistake of some one, made to say—"At a recent meeting of that same county (Surrey), *not one single hand* was held up expressing a want of confidence in the Ministers, and expressing a desire that they should be turned out." Now, Sir, this is precisely the contrary of what I did say, which was this:—"Not one single hand was held up *against a resolution*, expressing a want of confidence in them, and expressing a desire to have them turned out."

Having my pen in hand, let me observe, to the writer of the *Times* and the *Chronicle*, that already more than twenty addresses have come to the KING, praying him to *dissolve this present Parliament*; and yet, if we believe these desperate writers, the KING is to share the fate of "*Charles the First*," if he exercise his right in this respect! In 1831, these same writers threatened the KING with the fate of *Charles the First*, if he *did not* dissolve the Parliament! This is a pretty life for a King to lead! "I'd sooner be a dog and bay the moon," than be a King, capable of yielding to such threats as these. The KING will not yield to these threats; but, of course, will despise them, especially as he sees that his people are calling for the very thing that these scribbling hacks appear to be so much afraid of.

"*A Tory Ministry!*" There are no terrors in that sound. Every sensible man in the kingdom knows, that a Tory Ministry now would not be what a Tory Ministry was before. The Tories see that they are now strong; the Lords see that they are now strong, only because the Whigs are abandoned and reprobated by the people; the Lords see that this abandonment and reprobation has arisen from the cruel disappointment of the people; from no regard having been paid to their sufferings; and, of course, the Lords would take care to do *some part* at least, of the things which the people expected to have done. A very little, comparatively speaking, would have satisfied the people for the present. The people were not unreasonably impatient. A repeal of the malt tax, and of the house and window taxes, would have satisfied them for this year, together with a repeal of STURGES BOURNE's bills, and of the Whig Septennial Bill, for which measure the Marquis of WESTMINSTER himself moved, in 1817. Speaking for myself, I will say, that these measures would have satisfied me for the present, it being reasonable that *time* should have been allowed for the removal of such manifold grievances as now exist, and have so long existed.

But, Sir, this Whig thing has done *nothing* for the people; I verily believe from my soul, that a boroughmonger Parliament would have done more than this Parliament has, for the benefit of the people; because that Parliament would have endeavoured to reconcile the people to the representation, such as it was: whereas the Whigs have been emboldened by their immense majority, got together under the name of a *reform*, to refuse to do anything at all for the people, while they are adding millions upon millions to the national debt, the interest of which must be discharged, if at all, by the children yet in the cradle. For my part, Sir, I most sincerely believe, that a turning out of this Ministry would be a great benefit to the country; and, instead of "*the people arming themselves for the fight*," (as the *Times* calls on them to do), in order to keep this Ministry in their places, I say it is the duty of every county, every town, and every village, if possible, humbly to beseech his Majesty to be graciously pleased to turn them adrift.

You, Sir, are, I understand, prosecuted by these Whigs, *for endeavouring to bring the House of Commons into contempt*. I suppose there is no harm in *endeavouring to bring the House of Lords into contempt*. I suppose that the same law-officers who have prosecuted you, would be complained of by the *Times* and the *Chronicle*, if they were to prosecute them for these insolent, these contemptuous, these audacious, and these really and truly seditious attacks upon the House of Lords; for doing which, however, they may probably plead the example of certain persons belonging to a body, which it is unnecessary for me here to name.

I have troubled you uselessly, perhaps; for again I say, that from the north of Scotland to the Isle of Wight, from DOVER to PENZANCE, there is not one sensible and truly independent man to be found, who is not anxious to see the change so much dreaded by these two writers and their greedy patrons.

I should not wonder, Sir, if the Whigs were now suddenly to turn about, and to bring forward something with a view of conciliating the people; for their situation at this moment is truly awful: abandoned by the people, and the heavy hand of the Lords upon them! In all former cases they have had *hope*, even after a defeat; but, if they be driven out now, the door is shut against them *for ever*: it will be absolutely a political death, and there will be nothing left of the Whig faction but the hated name. They will die hard; they will kick and jerk and struggle to the last moment; but, Sir, die they must; and you will allow that it is mercy in me to give them this pull by the heels!—[N. B. *Petitions to the King* may be forwarded from the country to Members of Parliament, who can at once, cause them to be laid before his Majesty.]—At the least, there is a great probability of a dissolution of Parliament at no distant day. The electors have now seen the fatal consequences of their conduct at the last election. I do beseech them not to be cheated by the name of Whig, or Tory, or Liberal, or Radical, or Reformer, or any other NAME. Let them insist upon these things:—Repeal of the malt tax, of the house and window taxes, of the Septennial Bill, and of STURGES BOURNE's bills. These two last cost nothing to the Government; their existence yield nothing but a plentiful harvest of discontent. I have not the smallest doubt that a change of the Ministry would give us these things, and then we should have time to consider of further changes, without throwing everything into the air at once, like the stupid and greedy Whigs; who, while they are actually making a revolution, while they are tossing bishops, deans and chapters overboard, and bringing the Jews to supply their place, manifestly show that they intend to do no one thing for the advantage of *the people*. Their hack writers seem to be aiming at producing a conviction in the minds of the people *that the House of Lords ought to be destroyed*: but, Sir, let the people reflect for a moment on what their situation would be, if there were nothing *any where* to control the proceedings of that assembly which rescinded the vote on the malt tax; let them consider what our situation would be, if King and Lords were deprived of their real constitutional power, and we were left to be governed solely by that assembly! I need say not another word, the bare thought is enough to drive a man mad.

I am, Sir, your most obedient servant,

WM. COBBETT.

Bolt-court, Sunday, June 16.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TRUE SUN.

(From the True Sun of 18. instant.)

SIR,—I beg leave to trouble you once more, and that very shortly, on the efforts now making by the *Times* and the *Chronicle* to keep their patrons in power. To-day, they both harmoniously chime in the same sentiment: both warn the Tories against the danger of listening TO ME; for, one of them clearly points me out, and the other names me. They say that, being anxious to cause a revolution in the country, and perceiving that turning out the Ministers would produce such revolution, I am anxious about nothing but the turning of them out.

Now, Sir, as to the premises, that *I want to produce a revolution*. Do I revile the family of the King; do I, in substance, say, that the fate of CHARLES the First shall overtake him, if he do not destroy, utterly destroy, the House of Peers, in order to keep these Ministers in their places? Do I say that it would be right for Lord GREY, like another CATILINE, to “*instantly disband the army at home*,” if the KING turn out these Ministers? Do I tell the KING to “*learn the European lesson of the present century; to-day a throne—to-morrow is a prison*?” Do I call the House of Lords, the “*grand dépôt of corruption and public robbery*?” And is it by men who write thus, without appearing at all to dread the law-officers of the Crown; is it by such men that I am to be accused of aiming at revolution?

If, Sir, I did aim at revolution; if such an event could be looked forward to with delight by me, who can have no one earthly motive for wishing for a revolution; if I did wish for a revolution; meaning a total overthrow of this frame of Government, an abolition of titles, a confiscation, and a new distribution of estates; if I did wish for an event so terrible as this, so destructive of all men of title and of great estate, what could I desire more than to see these Ministers remain in power, and to pursue their present career? Why, Sir, in what have they been engaged for months past, but in politically shaking the kingdom to pieces? Instead of taking off the taxes, which they knew the people expected to be relieved from as the fruit of Reform, they have browbeaten every man who has dared to open his lips with a view of effecting that object. Men, fit to have been intrusted with the affairs of the nation at such a time, would have pacified the people in the first place, by taking off the malt and the house and window taxes; and then, they would have gone soberly and very slowly to work to make such other changes as were necessary; and, at every step, they would have taken care to have finished that which they had begun before they had proceeded with anything else.

Instead of acting thus, they have given a shake to everything, abroad as well as at home; and have taken special care to give the people satisfaction in nothing that they have

done. The *Church of Ireland Bill*, which they call a *Reform*, does nothing more than throw obloquy on that church; as good as tells the people that the church ought not to exist: and, at the same time, makes it as burdensome to the people as ever; represents it as an abuse, and declares at the same time that it shall be perpetual.

If I look at the West India project, I see that which was represented as a violation of all the laws of God, affected to be endeavoured to be put an end to by giving twenty millions of money out of the sweat of the people of England, as a compensation to those who had so long been violating those laws! A measure grounded upon the assumption, that free labour would produce more sugar than slave labour, and would be more advantageous to the planters; then giving the planters twenty millions to compensate them for their loss; and when Mr. BARING stood forward to expose this audacious inconsistency, I heard him assailed by noises such as I scarcely ever heard in my life. These colonies will be destroyed in all human probability; for it is too much to hope that they can escape amidst the complication of follies, with which this project abounds.

But, Sir, were there nothing but the legal-tender paper-money project (which will demand, on my part, a protest more formal than this); were there nothing but this project, what could I, if I wished for a total revolution in the country; what could I sigh for, or pray for, more than this one project? This project has been propounded in formal resolutions: let it be carried into execution, and he must be a most unreasonable Radical or Republican, that could desire any thing more. In short (and this is my answer to the *Times* and the *Chronicle*), I give it as my decided opinion (the reasons for which I have stated in my *Register*), that, if the propositions now before the House of Commons, be carried into effect, the whole frame of Government in this kingdom will be totally changed in less than four years. So that, if I do desire such revolution, I must be, in my efforts to get this Ministry turned out, the most disinterested and self-denying of all the creatures that God ever made.—I am, Sir, your most obedient and most humble servant,

WM. COBBETT.

Bolt-court, June 18, 1833.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TRUE SUN.

(From the True Sun of the 19. instant.)

SIR,—I was in hopes that I should not have been tempted to give you any further trouble upon the subject of the Whigs, the liberal Whigs, and their fright at the prospect of being turned adrift; but the poor old decayed *Chronicle* of this morning appears to be extremely angry with me for what it calls, “*joining the Tories*.” Now, Sir, I have not joined the Tories, and I do not care anything about names. I will “*join*” nobody; but I

will approve, and as far as I am able, support, for one whole year, at the least, any body who will take off the malt tax and the house and window tax, who will repeal the Whig-Septennial Act, who will repeal STURGES BOURNE's Bills, and drive all the *Malthusian* devils back to their native hell. To any Ministry and Parliament who would do these things, I would give *time* for doing other things; but to those who, so far from having done either of them, have testified their resolution never to do any of them, I will give every opposition that I am able; and I am very sure, that, in this respect, I have the approbation of every man in the kingdom, who does not either live on the taxes, or who is not seeking to live on the taxes.

The *Chronicle* blames me for discovering marks of hostility to the Whig Government, and says, "that it is *now* every thing that is execrable in my eyes." When were the Whigs *otherwise* in my eyes? Seven-and-twenty years I have held them in execration, as adding perfidy to all the bad qualities of the Tories. Amongst the good things which the *Chronicle* says the Whigs have done, is this; they have probed the evils of the poor-laws, with a view to remedy them as far as possible. This *probing* has made its appearance in a book, signed by the Poor-law Commissioners, by STURGES BOURNE, HARRY GAWLER, SENIOR, COULSON, and another, I believe; and contains matter collected by the *itinerant* poor-law men. As to the veracity of this book, Mr. HURST, the Member for Horsham, and Mr. GORING, the Member for Shoreham, most completely proved that it contained a tissue of abominable falsehoods with regard to that part of Sussex. I shall very soon have to show the extent of its veracity as to another part of the country. The objects of this book, and of the whole of this most expensive affair, are, first, to eulogize, and perpetuate, and harden, and extend STURGES BOURNE's Bills, against which petitions are every day coming from the great towns, and would come from every parish in the kingdom, if the sufferers had the means of sending them. The second object is, to pave the way for a *half-military police*, to be stationed in all the country towns and villages of England, Wales, and Scotland; and these things, it appears to be hoped, would enable the grinders of the working-people to compel them to live upon water-porridge and potatoes. Why, Sir, were there only this one thing, I, understanding the matter so well as I do, should be a most unjust and wicked man, if I did not wish to see power taken out of the hands of this Ministry. As I said the other day in the House of Commons, this Poor-law Commission is, in my opinion, costing more than the whole of the poor-rates of the county of Westmoreland. If this, then, be one of the *merits* of the Ministers, what, in God's name, can be the nature of their sins?

In short, Sir, this Ministry have no defence. The people confidently expected that the malt tax and the house tax and the window tax

would be taken off: the Ministry and the House of Commons have refused to do the latter: the House resolved on a Friday, that it would take off half the former; and, on the next Tuesday, the Minister called upon the House to resolve, and it did resolve, that it would take off none of it. The Tories might act in the same manner for anything that I know to the contrary: but until the *Chronicle* can show us that we should lose by the change, and that it ought not to be a gratification to us to see the Whigs *punished* for their conduct, it may endeavour in vain to rouse the *people*—aye, and even the "*reformed constituency*," an appellation which it now uses instead of the people. The *Chronicle* tells us, that the Tories are holding out the bait, "that they will take off taxes;" and that is precisely what I want; and, if the Tories break their word, they will only then be approaching towards a level with the Whigs.

I am, Sir,

Your most obedient and humble servant,
WM. COBBETT.
St. James's Park, June 19, 1833.

(From the *Times* of the 15. instant.)

The privileges of the Peers were granted to them by the constitution, not for the sake of the Peers themselves, but that they might be the better enabled to discharge certain public and specified duties. When the Peers, or any portion of them, make the enjoyment of their privileges the most essential object of their political efforts, they forfeit, in fact, the condition on which those privileges were vested in them.

The Tory party seems now to have decided that the whole realm shall be subdued to its will, and that those interests which are acknowledged by the nation and its representative to be the most precious and important of all others, shall be sacrificed to the selfish views of a certain branch of the aristocracy. This will never do. It is all very well to put forth common-places on the constitution, and to talk about a difference between the two Houses of Parliament, or, in other words, "a collision," as just nothing at all—something which the framers of the constitution looked forward to as a matter of course, not having any results or tendencies beyond the mere assertion by each branch of the legislature of its own distinct and admitted power. Now, let us quietly ask these free-and-easy gentlemen whether the independent rights of each House of Parliament were given in contemplation of their co-operating on important subjects, or of their drawing in different and opposite lines? If concurrence were not the rule, and variance the exception—and the rare exception, too,—it is plain that the Government of the commonwealth must soon be brought to a state of political paralysis. A difference between the two Houses on very

serious questions can no otherwise be considered than as involving constitutional dangers of the deepest import. Reform in Parliament is one of these; church reform is one of them, and perhaps the most perilous of all such questions on which the Lords and Commons could divide. Vain and foolish is it to ring in our ears that the Lords may do so and so, if they like. Of course they may—and of course they must take the consequences. The English nation will not be cheated out of what they deem the substance of their own prosperity, out of complaisance to the abstract, however acknowledged, rights of the Upper House of Parliament. If rights be indiscreetly and mischievously exercised, they are, in fact, abused; and if abused, the abuse will by an intelligent and high-principled people be resisted. If one party must give way, then the Peers must give way, for the nation will not, and ought not, to do so where its vital interests are concerned.

The House of Commons should be prepared for such emergencies—not, indeed, to follow the old precedent, and vote the House of Lords “a nuisance,” but to put on record *instantly* that the House of Lords, by setting itself repeatedly and perseveringly in direct opposition to *that reform* which is demanded by the whole people of England, has rendered it impossible to carry on the Government without an absolute extinction of that assembly which represents the people, and the establishment of a pure oligarchy in place of King, Lords, and Commons.

We have reason to apprehend that the leaders of the so-called “conservative” faction meditate a direct war upon the nation. We do not mean a war of words or sentiments, or legislative measures, but literally a war of the bayonet and the sabre. We have no doubt that there are some persons who would, almost immediately on their accession to the Government, declare formally against any reformation of abuses,—pronounce that reform and republicanism were identified, that both must be put down *coute qui coute*, and ancient corruptions clung to,—and that if any show of resistance, even within the forms of the constitution, be presented by the body of the people, that then, without an hour’s delay, the glove should be thrown down, the troops appealed to, and the standard of despotism and misgovernment hoisted, in the name of our upright, constitutional, and beloved Monarch. We assert all this from a knowledge of facts as they occur. There is nothing figurative in the statement; all is literal, all is true. The subject has been well discussed in the Conservative council. The army is described to be “*stanch to a man*,” What might, what must be the fate of him who employs it to such sanguinary and traitorous ends has, we suspect, been but slightly adverted to. The military and court faction (the highest personage of all forming a noble exception), the military faction and court faction are besotted enough to imagine that if certain persons were once

in power the battle might yet be restored and the day be won. They are the most ignorant, the most infatuated, the most unteachable of all human beings, who so judge the people of this country: within three months of such an attempt being made not a vestige of Conservatism would be left throughout the kingdom. In the mean time, every city, county, borough, and parish in the island, ought to be in readiness for whatever, even the worst that might happen. Petitions, remonstrances, declarations of distrust in a “Conservative” Ministry, ought to be prepared in case of necessity; the House of Commons ought to be on the alert, and, should events require them, be ready to pass resolutions and addresses to the Sovereign that specific persons whom we will not now name should be dismissed for ever from the service of the Crown, and banished from the royal presence. Another bill should be sent up to the Peers, the same hour in which the appointment of a Minister professing to govern by the sword was promulgated, for disbanding the Guards and the whole of the army now at home. A nation must not be nice about details when its existence or liberties are threatened. In our opinion, no crisis ever arose in Great Britain more pregnant with grave alarm than that on the eve of which we at this moment stand. As for a dissolution of the existing Parliament, one man—and one only—among the Conservatives can be blind enough to plunge into such an experiment,—it is he who made the grand blunder of denouncing, and thereby producing a reform of Parliament.

(From the Times of the 17. instant.)

The confidence of the country in a satisfactory or even peaceable issue of the present crisis rests much upon the well-known earnestness of the King in his conviction of the necessity of supporting the reform principle, and in his consequent determination to maintain, so far as in his power, the policy of his present Ministers against that of the Tory faction. But it may not long be at the option of his Majesty to indulge his own choice of Ministers or measures. The adverse faction has a majority in the House of Peers which may at any time frustrate the best intentions of his Majesty, and select its own hour for striking a decisive blow. It is plain enough that the natural and most effectual method of averting a danger like this would be the creation of a sufficient number of reform Peers; but such an expedient, though within the letter of the constitution, cannot be regarded as devoid of evil consequences, any more than that violent exercise which is now anticipated of the legislative, or anti-legislative, powers vested in the Peers themselves, will be considered innocent by the nation. An extensive creation of Peers, indeed, as a means of remedying or counteracting some occasional abuse of their acknowledged privileges by the majority, could hardly be excused by any

emergency short of threatened *convulsion* or *civil war*. *Whether one or both* such justifications may not *soon present themselves* to our embarrassed Sovereign, is a question to be resolved hereafter.

But, besides the majority, of which the Tory chiefs are conscious, there are other circumstances, unfortunately too notorious, which furnish them with strong encouragement to bring their anti-reform forces into action. *The King*, we repeat, is single-minded, and staunch in his maintenance of the reform principles, and of the existing Ministry. Nevertheless, looking to the composition of *his court*, and to the known and incessant machinations of some of its members, many persons besides the Tories, whose interest would naturally bias their judgments on such a point, have questioned on which side the royal preference lay, and have even set up the sinister conduct which his Majesty tolerates in those about him to rebut the more direct evidence of his personal acts and professions. The King is too much a man of honour to suspect that the world would ever question *his* sincerity. He speaks and expects, what he well deserves credit for, *inviolable truth*. But it might with all reverence and duty be submitted to the Sovereign, that if he wish well to the cause of reform, and to the stability of the actual Administration, he will study the semblance, as much as the substance, of truth. His Majesty, for such an object, will be anxious to get rid of *certain nuisances* which infest the palace, and which throw an air of ambiguity and mystery over the fair exterior of his own royal inclinations. Nothing would seem more strange than that with a reforming and enlightened King, the courtiers, male and female, without a single dissident, should take pains to be signalized as open enemies to his official advisers. Were it not for the *irretrievable reputation* of *certain* members of the *Royal Family* itself, it might seem passing strange that, with one patriotic exception, the nearest relations of the Sovereign should be mustered by public opinion among the ranks of the opposition to his Majesty's Government. Ought this to be? Without the slightest spirit of needless intermeddling in the social arrangements of the court, we must aver that the unvarying prevalence of Tories, and intriguing Tories, too, both as settled functionaries in the court circle, and as its occasional visitors and guests, has a tendency of grave and twofold mischief. It excites among common observers an unavoidable suspicion, that as the court is three-fourths of it inveterate Tory, so the chief personage of the court, whose finger if held up would silence the Conservative clamour, and raise a counter war-cry against those Conservatives, —that he, we repeat, is not in his heart, *beyond a small fraction*, *Whig*. The formidable influence of such a general impression in raising the spirits of the Tory party, and in undermining the moral power of the *responsible* Government, is a subject well worthy of the

King's most serious consideration. Had his Majesty been less passive or incurious as to the formation of that society which is called in common parlance "the court," and had he from the outset been pleased to order that it should *not* be so framed as to encourage Toryism, and to discountenance his own official servants and their principles, we should by this time have heard very little about the possible overthrow of Lord Grey's cabinet by a majority in the Upper House of Parliament, or about the alternatives which must now be resorted to in the hope of averting *revolution*. His Majesty's course is negative as well as positive. The Tories ought not to have ground for boasting, nor the friends of Ministers ground for complaining, that the latter have less of court blandishment and favour than their implacable enemies. If a premium were offered for the most certain mode of overturning a Ministry whose sole support was their character, it would be won by him who should so contrive it as to pass a persuasion upon the world that their Sovereign, who must have known both parties well, *did not* appreciate or regard *his own servants so highly* as those who, in the nature of things, must succeed them. We repeat, and insist upon it, that *at bottom all is right*; but on the surface these irregularities are apparent, which, after all, it would be the easiest thing on earth to correct by a glance of the eye from the Sovereign.

If the King desires that his Ministers *should stand*, he will prevent the subalterns of his own family and household from imprecating and predicting their downfall in every company. His Majesty will issue orders that those who frequent his royal board, and are received as intimates by the highest personages about him, shall not be individuals distinguished no otherwise than by the rankness of their Tory spirit. He will command royal persons to abstain from intriguing against his ostensible Government; he will himself keep aloof from Conservative associations, which, if they do not corrupt the moral sense, do assuredly affect the good repute of those who enter them. Their is great *activity* and *pruriency* of *mischief* in *some of those* with whom *ties may exist* which it would not be decorous for an *exalted individual* to acknowledge. Towards *them* the rebuke ought to be *severe*, and on *them* there should be laid at once a stern and inexorable prohibition against presuming to meddle with politics. If these points he not conceded, *Lord Grey ought to resign at once*, and then *God help his successor*!

Every one foresaw, from the first announcement of the measure of reform which has since been passed into a law, that the old faction which had for so many years held possession of the Government, by the single tenure of an abuse of all the national institutions, would resist to the utmost, and, if necessary, die in the last ditch of the last of the rotten boroughs. The Tory portion of the *House of Lords*—the great *depôt of corruption*

and public robbery—did, indeed, fight a hard battle for their boroughs, and were only deterred from carrying the opposition further by the dread of seeing a creation of liberal Peers, which would have wrested the fixed majority of the House out of the Tory hands, and thus deprived their own junta of the power of stopping the *future* progress of freedom, riding roughshod over the Whig Ministry, as often as occasion might serve, and getting rid of them by one deadly vote at the most convenient moment. This, we doubt not, was the tactic of the Conservative camp, and to its evil ends it was contrived with subtilty. How these Conservatives had employed their official power is not unknown to the country. It was a regular scheme of *fraud and plunder*. They used the produce of the taxes as a landlord does the rents of his own freehold estate; the treasury was emptied to find *unearned incomes for their unprovided and expensive families*, and the public service pinched in many important branches that these *swarms of patrician locusts* might be multiplied and gorged. Due pains, however, were at all times taken by the Tories to shroud these transactions in impenetrable darkness. For years it was with the utmost difficulty that a single official document, when moved for, could be wrung from the Tory predecessors of the reform Government of a nature to throw light upon the *pensions and sinecures* held by their *connexions*. It was "*harsh*," it was "*invidious*," it was "*unnecessary*!" As to any efficient check to this iniquity, the thing was laughed at; indeed it was impracticable, and for this obvious reason—that a Parliament which did not represent the nation, but the oligarchy, could be kept in order no otherwise than by a systematic bribing of the lordly proprietors of the House of Commons, and that no administration could stand for a month which did not satisfy their cravings. But since the accession of Lord Grey to office *full information on the details of this abominable corruption has been laid before the country*. In another part of this journal will be found an extract from the list of sinecures lately printed by the House of Commons, where the working of the Tory principle of government is illustrated by a few instances, taken almost at random from a catalogue of several hundreds, and which affords explanations of the virtuous impulses which actuate the Conservatives as a body. The efforts now making by the faction of which a certain military Duke is the leader to crush or check the reform spirit (such is their madness!) *before its fruits can be made available to the people of England by specific measures for carrying the principle into effect*, are just the agonies of a dying robber, clutching convulsively the purse of gold about to escape from him for ever. Lord Melville's influence with the Tory cabinets for the last 25 or 30 years arose from his power over a large Scottish faction, which he and his ancestor, the celebrated Harry Dundas, had hired into their

service by a dexterous application of the public money; nor were the personal interests of the house of Dundas forgotten. We find by this list that Viscount Melville (a prime favourite, be it known, with the Duke of Wellington, and with the *unfriendly* officers of the British Navy—God save the mark!) had long ago bestowed upon himself a pretty sinecure, entitled "Keeper of the Privy Seal of Scotland," producing to this patriotic Tory a good 3,000*l.* per annum. His Lordship's son, the Hon. William Dundas, has another sinecure, that of Keeper of the Signet, 2,300*l.* and a third sinecure, (good heaven!) viz., Register of Srisius, of 5,500*l.* per annum—11,000*l.* between father and son! Lord Ellenborough (a Conservative, not without cause shown) has an office—a flagrant sinecure, cut down in defiance of all good government from 9,500*l.* to upwards of 6,000*l.* a year, besides half of another sinecure of 2,000*l.*! The Irish Tory (Knox) Lord Ranfurly has wriggled himself, by a discreet management of his borough of Dungannon, into a sinecure legal office, for which he has been awarded the villainous "compensation" of 7,150*l.* per annum. So, Lord Hardwicke, compensation to the amount 7,150*l.* per annum; two Beresfords ("Beresfords," a name to turn a whole nation's stomach!) have *sinecure* compensation of 4,300*l.* per annum; Earl Bathurst (old Bathurst), 3,700*l.* per annum; the Duke of Montrose, an old Tory duke, 2,000*l.* per annum; so Seymours (Hertford Seymours), Jenkinson, Percevals, Kenyons, Malmesburys, Manchesters (Duke of Manchester), figure in this precious list, all atrocious Tories. There are others, almost endless, male and female; they shall be notified and enlarged upon at the fitting season. They are all of the same kidney—the Wellington faction. With them any guardianship, by representatives of the people, over their own money, any obstacle to the Tory monopoly and perpetuity of plunder, is no less than "revolution." Equality of rights, and of legal protection, that, in the eyes of the Tory interest of the Wellington clique—that is republicanism, and must be put down *by the sword*. Yes, that is the final decision and doctrine of the Tories. "Make the Duke Minister," they cry, "and he will put the rascals down in a month." *He will take off the assessed taxes* to gain a little passing popularity. *He will give 1*l.* notes* to augment the amount of gambling speculation and (*utterly worthless*) money. *He will take reaction* (ay "reaction," the idiots expect that) at the flood, and then *dissolve the Parliament*. And what Parliament will he get by such a dissolution? "Return a Tory Parliament through dint of enormous bribery, govern by its votes, and marshal the army to support them." Why, the whole corporation has gone stark mad. What! bribe the English nation, once awake to the plots of its enemies, into a co-operation with them. All the treasures that have been dug out of the earth since the deluge would not buy the present, *however im-*

perfect, constituency of England to the return of a Tory Parliament! Let that game, then, be abandoned at once as desperate—let the *military faction*, and that other spurious faction which torments and disgraces the royal chambers—let them stick to more feasible devices—let them appeal *directly to the layonet*. Fail of course it will, but fail it cannot more assuredly than the blockhead scheme of ruling this roused people by a conservative House of Commons. Toryism and errorism are equally *bastard* weapons of *sovereign power*, and *bastards enough may be found to wield them both*; but there is no Falconbridge about the court of William.

(From the Times of the 18. instant.)

Nothing can equal the delight of the ultra-Radicals at the prospect of a Tory administration. But does this inculcate no lesson of distrust on the minds of the Tories themselves? Do they not see the meaning of it? Ask a Tory partisan or leader (they are all alike) what he presumes to be the object of the Radical party. He will tell you, of course, that they aim at "nothing short of revolution." How comes it then, we reply, that this *confessedly revolutionary faction* "rejoice so loudly at the chance of the Tories returning to office?" Manifestly, because a Tory Government would be a step, and a sure one, towards the radical *summum bonum*—a revolution. Does this, we repeat, suggest to sober-minded Tories, if the race be not extinct, no misgivings as to the issue of their intended enterprise? If, by the expulsion of Lord Grey's Government, and their speedy succession, it should turn out that the Tories were but playing the game of the revolutionists, might it not have been discreet in the Wellington party to pause a little before they had compromised their own and the public safety,—"to look," at least, "before they leaped?" Unhappily, for indeed it has ere now been a grave misfortune, there is scarcely a knot of persons in the kingdom so utterly unacquainted with the prevailing spirit of the population as the Wellington coterie and its distinguished leader. They know literally nothing of their countrymen,—they seek not, and have never sought, information respecting what was said or felt throughout the community, even on questions affecting their own political interests, and their favourite measures, but such as could be collected from their official or family dependents, a class of men who always accommodate their language to the ears which listen to it. Could the Duke himself have ever fallen into that miraculous blunder concerning a reform in Parliament, had he not been under some fatal Downing-street hallucination, of which there are, or rather used to be, many?

It is with precisely as much useful knowledge of the sentiments and feelings of the people of England that the Tories now meditate a return to power, and have pre-arranged

minutely the mode in which it shall be exercised, as their chief possessed when he made that immortal speech against reform, which may be justly said to have accelerated the extinction of the whole contents of schedule A. If the Tories will govern, they must govern on Tory principles with *consent of the present House of Commons*, which, from the whole of its recorded votes, they may perceive to be quite impracticable, or they must adopt at least an equally high tone and complexion of liberality with those of the predecessors whom they are about to dismiss, or, finally, they must *appeal to the country*, dissolve the present Parliament, and assemble a new one. The first of these attempts and the last would indicate nearly a like degree of Quixotism, while the second would argue such a barefaced (though not unprecedented) abandonment of all political principle as could only be expected from him who offered to carry that very reform which he had so recently and so emphatically deprecated.

The fact is, that it would be wholly impossible for the Tory faction to rule this country during, we had almost said, the present generation of Englishmen. They are so bound up and identified with principles of policy, foreign and domestic, which have for years been repudiated by all men of independent feeling; they have proved so eager to incorporate themselves with the cause of despotism abroad, as in the case of Miguel—with that of abuse and oppression at home, as in that of the rotten boroughs, the rotten corporations, and the Irish church, that England would behold with even more lively satisfaction a regiment of Cossacks coming from Constantinople to be the official advisers of his Majesty, as they have been and are of his imperial Majesty the Grand Turk, than a "*shool*" of Conservatives (to adopt the happy expression of Lord Brougham) forming the Cabinet Council of King William.

We find that there are *blockheads* who charge us with *being in the hire of the Whig Ministers*. When has the *Times*, which fails not to give its unbought approbation to any Minister, Whig or Tory, when his measures deserve it,—when, we say, has the *Times* shrunk from the duty of arraiguing and exposing ministerial error or incapacity? Was it last year, when Lord Grey, we thought, proved slack or timorous in his dealings with the refractory peerage? Was it when the military apparatus of the Irish Coercion Bill was daily assaulted by this "hired servant" of the Minister? Was it on the factory commission that we failed to take the poor children's part against the Minister? or on the non-repeal of the assessed taxes,—or the Coldbath-fields dispersion of that which was *no riot*, and which needed not to have been a mob,—or on the *silly bargain with the Bank of England*,—or on the slow progress of the Irish Church Reform Bills, compared with the Bill of Coercion;—or, again, in their abandonment of the whole mass of military

patronage to Tories,—or their general want of courage and vigour in pushing any policy of the value of which they were convinced? On these, and many other topics and occasions, it is in the memory of all our readers that we flinched not from the duty, however irksome and painful, of severest commentary upon faults, whether of commission or omission, in the very Ministers of whom we are charged with being slaves. We are slaves, indeed, but it is to *conscience and truth*. If we have served Ministers, as it is to be hoped we often have done, we were no otherwise enabled to do so than through the general persuasion that, if so minded, we were at full liberty to oppose them. Let Lord Grey's Government flag once more in its public duties, and the *Times* will be the earliest amongst its castigators, and not the gentlest. That, and that alone, gives worth and influence to our applause.

The public will see from our report of yesterday's parliamentary proceedings with what patriotic zeal and diligence the Tory peers flocked to their places on the committal of the Chancellor's bill for establishing local courts throughout the kingdom, and *bringing justice within the reach of the injured poor*. Their Lordships came doubtless in such numbers to give their strictest and most earnest attention to the examination of this important bill. Well! Lord Brougham made a speech in introducing the subject; Lord Lyndhurst spoke in opposition to it,—an enterprise which by this time, we apprehend, his Lordship regrets having undertaken, for the Lord Chancellor replied—and such a reply! such a *mawling*! But no matter; the whole thing is now in print, and the country will agree upon the same judgment with regard to it as was, we take for granted, formed by the Lords themselves. Happy are we to record such an instance of a legislative assembly calmly hearing, and justly deciding, according to their conviction. Lord Lyndhurst, who no doubt partook of the same conviction, abandoned his opposition, and declined his intended division. This is candour worthy the noble and learned Lord! How delightful to see this triumph of reason over party! How pleased, and with how much reason, must the Peers be of their last night's proceeding!

(From the Morning Chronicle of the 14. instant.)

We find that our predictions yesterday respecting the plot in the House of Peers to attempt the overthrow of the present Government, may be realized sooner even than we anticipated. Cabals and intrigues are going on in all quarters. Certain branches of an illustrious family, both *legitimate* and *illegitimate*, are, as on the occasion of their resistance to the Reform Bill, more than usually active in their canvass to obtain votes and

proxies for the threatened collision. *The Court even is said to be insincere*. This has always been the report when matters have approached a crisis—spread, as we have reason to believe, by the *Tory dames* infesting the purlieus of St. James and Windsor, with as much truth, or rather with as much probability of success, as distinguished their efforts on the former memorable and eventful occasion, when their temporary triumph over the weaker feelings of the Sovereign only proved how hopeless was the chance of resistance to the will of the people. Can this game, however, be played again, or rather, how often can it be played, at the desperate risk of revolutionary movements? Let those beware of the consequences who provoke the crisis. The Bishops are probably beyond hope, and beyond cure. But we recommend to the Dukes of Cumberland and Gloucester, and some of the ladies of that family, a perusal of those passages in our history which recount the events of the early parts of the reign of the First, and the latter days of that of the Second Charles. *A bill will probably soon pass the House of Commons, repealing the act of Charles II., under the provisions of which the Fathers of the Church are now enabled to pervert the privilege given to them of sitting in the House of Lords for far different objects, to the purposes of political faction and intrigue. May no Bill of exclusion of greater personages from greater privileges follow?* May no address of the House of Commons remove a Duke of Cumberland, as it did a Duke of York, from the court of the King, and deprive him of the means of plotting against a reforming administration and the public interests? We caution—we entreat these mighty and sapient personages to beware how they trifle with the *public feelings*! And if there are personages even *greater than they—male or female*—who suppose that the English people will submit, without enforcing RETRIBUTION from the authors of such calamities to a repetition of the scenes and the dangers which distinguished the insane attempt of the Duke of Wellington and Mr. Baring to assume the Government on the temporary defeat of the Reform Bill, we pray them to “look before they leap,” and to ascertain, from better informed persons than the blue bottles, bred in the corruption of all courts, at what risk that experiment can be again tried?

We tell the public that a crisis is again at hand, and that they must be prepared to *buckle on their armour for the fight*. If our warning voice have no effect, then, as we said in the olden time, “The Lord's will be done.” We shall watch with a vigilance only equalled by our anxiety the progress of coming events, and sincerely pray that our anticipations, from the evident symptoms of the intention of the Tory and Episcopal aristocracy, to come to issue with the House of Commons and the people, may be exaggerated, and our apprehensions ultimately removed by the conversion of the Peers and Bishops “unto wisdom.”

either through a wholesome apprehension of the calamities which may be entailed, first upon themselves, and eventually upon the country, or from a calm reconsideration of the principles on which their conduct ought to be regulated under existing circumstances.

In the mean time it may be desirable that Members of the House of Commons should look to the means by which some of the parties most intimately connected with the Tory faction are enabled to maintain that position in society, from which a large portion of their pernicious influence is derived. In p. 1, of Paper 304, printed for the use of the House in the present session, some splendid instances of the corruption of past times, and the extravagant folly of the public, will be found—*We need only refer to the first name in the catalogue—that of the Right Hon. C. Arbuthnot, who receives* (proh pudor!) *3,842l. per annum—besides a pension to Mrs. Arbuthnot of 800l. (we believe) on the civil list—and for what services?*

(From the Morning Chronicle of the 15. inst.)

The Tory aristocracy is determined to commit political suicide. We have forewarned the country that the present intention of the Conservative Peers is to throw out, by a considerable majority, the bills for church reform. This *malignant design* has a twofold object—to drive out of office the present Ministry, that the Tories may punish them for their amendment of the representation, and usurp the reins of power—and to defeat the ends of which parliamentary reform was the intended means. The Tory press is actively urging on its blind party to this desperate course, forgetful of its recent admissions that the reconstruction of the House of Commons had rendered it impossible for any Administration to govern the country, and had exiled for ever from office the Tory party. It is not many weeks since the *Standard* openly avowed its preference of revolution to the continuance of Lord Grey's cabinet; and a coalition between the Ultra-Tories and the Ultra-Radicals has been openly recommended by the Conservatives in their profound despair. Such an unnatural and absurd combination of extremes is not only ridiculous to imagine, but cannot by possibility happen. And what do the Tory Peers expect to gain by their desperate and destructive designs? Do they hope to repeal the Reform Acts, and to repossess themselves of their rotten boroughs? Can they blind themselves to the fact, that the aristocratic principle is essentially destroyed in this country, and that all Europe is in a state of rapid transition from feudal to federal principles of government? Is it possible that the popular power should recede—can its advance be prevented? Blind and infatuated must the Tory aristocracy be not to perceive that a legal revolution has been effected—not by the Whigs, but by the people, and earlier than it would otherwise have come, from the

mad and infatuated resistance of Tory Administrations to the mere shadows of reform? And what do the Lords really intend by their threatened opposition? They object to three parts of the Irish Church Reform Bills; to the reduction of the number of Bishops—to the relief of Catholics and Dissenters from tithes and church-cess, by the appropriation of part of the revenues of the church in lieu of these odious imposts—and to the application of any surplus revenue of the church to other objects of national utility. If the Irish Church Bill is thrown out on these grounds of objection, and Lord Grey's cabinet retire, what would be the course of any Tory successors? Would they dare to uphold the existing system? Could they do it, however much they might desire to prop up the Irish church establishment? If, on the other hand, the Tory Lords fail to throw out the present Administration, then, as in the case of the Reform Bills, a more extensive measure of Church Reform would assuredly be successfully proposed in the *next Session of Parliament*. By the smallness of the present measure the Ministers have lost friends, and *suffered in public opinion*, and betrayed a *vain hope of conciliating* implacable political enemies. Four Bishops and an Archbishop were surely a sufficient number of shepherds, and more than sufficient in the opinion of a majority of reformers in the House of Commons, for tending the Protestant flocks in Ireland; and the Irish Church Establishment *may be reduced next Session, if the present Bill miscarries*, to one Archbishop and four Bishops. If such a reduction failed in the next Session, then the entire abolition of the Irish Church would follow in the succeeding one! Such would be the natural and infallible consequences of the folly and stupidity of the Tory faction: the Tories always succeed in annihilating abuses which they desire to maintain. The present Ministry, say the Tories, are unpopular with the country, because they have done too little in the vineyard of reform; and the Conservatives hope to succeed them, and gain favour with the people by *doing nothing!* The budget of Lord Althorp was stated by Sir Robert Peel to secure *too small a surplus* and *to smack of excessive retrenchment*. The Tories are in fits of horror at the distant sound of municipal reforms: the *insane Bishops* hang with the Tory Peers in defending *non-residence*—in maintaining *pluralities*—in perpetuating tithes, church-cess, and an unnecessary band of ecclesiastical drones, and yet the people (says the Conservative press) yearn for the return of the Tories to office! And to what events and consequences would the advent of a Tory Administration lead us? The *Standard* would insinuate, that if the present House of Commons was "*refractory*," a "*Conservative*" House of Commons would replace it. Our contemporary cannot be serious, and is only decoying the Duke of Wellington and Sir Robert Peel to destruction, as a punishment for that never-to-be-forgiven

sin, their sudden conversion to Catholic emancipation. The Ultra-Tories owe their *ci-devant* friends much revenge on this old score, and will never be easy till they have given them another dose of that bitter antipathy they displayed on the memorable motion of Sir Henry Parnell. A dissolution of Parliament indeed, grounded on an obstinate refusal by a majority of Peers of any quantum of Church Reform, and a collision with the House of Commons on such a vital question of state policy! Can any man, topically acquainted only with the present state of the public mind, except that his grace the Duke of Wellington would obtain by dissolution a subservient House of Commons? The Tories can now muster barely *one hundred and twenty* members in that branch of the legislature. Some of the *moderate men* of both parties might lose their seats if sent at this period before their constituents; but admitting that 30 or 40 seats might be gained in addition to the present "*conservative*" numbers, would the Duke of Wellington numerically govern the new House? Would he not, by such a dissolution, call up more decided Reformers? and would his *quondam* enemies the *political unions*, support the destructive administration against the public opinion of the reformed constituency? Would the Whigs *out of office* leave him *any rest* in either House of Parliament? The *ruse* is a miserable and shallow deception. If the reform acts have not realized *so early as expected* the *sanguine expectations* of the people, they have at least given the people ample power to destroy a Tory administration. The return of such a Government—its co-existence with a reformed House of Commons—is *impossible*; and if the Duke of Wellington flatters himself that he can retake the *citadel of the Horse Guards*, he is as miserably deceived as he proved himself in May, when he risked the throne of the King, and placed the nation on the verge of revolution. We suspect that Sir Robert Peel *knows more* of the state of the public mind, and would risk neither his property nor his political station in such a mad project. His Grace is old enough to turn his thoughts beneficially, from *this to another world*. And who are those wild and infuriated aristocrats who call themselves, *par excellence*, loyal, and the exclusive friends of the monarchy? They are the real enemies of his Majesty; the genuine destructives; the active republicans. Not content with the lamentable injury they perpetrated on William IV., in May last year, they would again betray him, and again lay prostrate his popularity. Can they not discern that they are scattering far and wide the seeds of an early harvest of democracy? Do they want the substitute of an *American King*? or are they anxious to pull down, prematurely, the hereditary peerage? Are the examples of *Charles I.*, and *Louis XVI. lost on the court of St. James*? Have they not learned the European lesson of the present century—"To-day, a throne; to-morrow is a prison?" The King

has, however, shown no ordinary courage in perplexing and trying times; and on the good sense and political sagacity of his Majesty the country relies; he has too much at stake himself to be deceived by faction, by courtiers, or political maniacs.

(From the Morning Chronicle of the 17. inst.)

The Tory press first announced that the great crisis of the British constitution was near at hand. The *Standard* was instructed to make public the recent determination of the "*Conservative*" aristocracy to array itself against the great majority of the Commons and the people. The Tories would fain persuade the country that their political plots now in progress, and their opposition are against *men*, and not against *measures*. They affect to scorn the mere design of repossessing themselves of the power and *sweets* of office; they assert that they must save the nation from a rival faction. But these pretences will not impose on the understandings of the *constituency* of the empire. Their votes, and their conduct in Parliaments past and present, will not serve to cloak their pretences. For half a century the Tories have frightfully *misgoverned* this country. They created all the *political difficulties under which we now labour*. The "*National Debt*" is their creature. They refused to reform the evils of the *Colonial system*; they upheld every species of political and commercial monopoly; they persecuted the *Reformers*, and resolutely resisted every proposition for amending the representation. In 1830 the Tory machinery of corruption went to pieces, and the monster of despotism which Tory foreign policy had reared on the Continent tumbled down. The last French Revolution opened the eyes of the British people to the weakness of despotic power; and Earl Grey, at a period of extraordinary peril, was called to the councils of the King, as the only man who, under all the peculiar circumstances of parties, could save this country from a fearful and bloody revolution. A *legal* revolution—that is to say, an extraordinary and new distribution of political power—became necessary to avert more extreme and violent changes. The Ministry proposed, and the Sovereign wisely sanctioned, the Cabinet measure of Parliamentary Reform. The great body of the people had previously demanded, in numerous and successive public meetings, changes in the representation far more extensive than the Whig Cabinet conceded; but the good sense of the country cordially accepted the Ministerial project. Such was the determination and enthusiasm of the then existing constituency (limited and influenced as it unquestionably was by the Tory aristocracy) that on the dissolution of Parliament in 1831, the electoral body returned an overwhelming majority of representatives to the House of Commons for the single and pledged purpose of passing into laws the ministerial measures. The Reform Bills were triumphantly carried

through the Lower House of Parliament, notwithstanding the fierce and dogged opposition of the Tories, headed by Sir Robert Peel. That practised politician, of the modern Tory school, based all his objections on the ground of the impossibility of the co-existence of the two Houses of Legislature—the Lords and Commons—if the election of the latter was vested in the proposed constituency. He predicted the necessary consequence of an early republic, and that no future administration, of any party, could conduct the executive Government of the nation. Every possible and cunning argument was used by the wily Baronet to embolden the Tory Peers to exercise their veto and reject the ministerial measures. In vain the anti-reformers were forewarned of the evil of subjecting the Monarch and the hereditary Peerage to the consequences of tempting the people to force the question to a successful issue. The Tory aristocracy was infatuated, and blindly bent on self-destruction. A majority of the Peers in effect defeated the English Reform Bill. Unhappily, perhaps designedly, they temporarily prostrated the just popularity of the King; they prevented a creation of Peers, and the memorable result was the virtual suspension by the Tory Lords of their legislative powers. If history did not exhibit the born-blind nature of aristocracies, it might have been conjectured that the bitter humiliation of the Tory nobility in May last year, would have enlightened their understandings; but experience can teach them no lesson—"they pawn their experience to their present pleasure." Public opinion, at this memorable period, was much divided on the necessity and expediency of an addition to the Peerage. An almost uninterrupted succession of Tory administrations for half a century had swamped the House of Lords with Tory Peers of bigoted political principles. Upwards of two hundred Commoners were translated to the Upper House, and the Episcopal Bench was exclusively filled with clergymen of high steeple and Tory sentiments. It was anxiously desired at the great crisis in May last year by all intelligent reformers, not members of the aristocracy, that "as a choice of evils," new Peers should have been created in order to pass the Reform Bills with some decent conformity to the theory of the constitution, and to avoid the evil of the otherwise certain application of the popular power. Every politically-informed and reflecting person, moreover, clearly foresaw, that if the constitution of the House of Commons was altered, the character of the peerage must also be ultimately popularised. A tremendous revolution and a premature republic, it was argued, must be the certain consequence of the continued stagnancy of the political mind of the aristocracy. "More peers or none" was emphatically predicted, if the vain attempt should be made of working a reformed House of Commons with an unreformed House of Lords. A King must be naturally averse to any extraordinary exercise

of the constitutional prerogative of increasing his nobility, and the aristocratic members of the cabinet could not desire to resort to an unprecedented creation of new Peers unless absolutely necessary to the preservation of the form of Government. The *ultra-Radicals* were and are equally opposed to an increase of the Peerage. In their ardent desire for a popular constitution—in their sanguine views of the moral and intellectual state of the people—in their forgetfulness of the complicated evils which violent political changes would produce in this country, and at the bare prospect of which every wise and virtuous man shudders—the *ultra-Reformers* anxiously desire a collision between the two Houses of Parliament, and seek too soon the total extinction of the old political parties of the state. Unquestionably, if it be desirable to hasten a violent revolution in the British Empire, we should not add to the Peerage; but if we are to avert a dreadful and impending political catastrophe, we confess we see no salvation but in the creation of new Peers. The present critical posture of public affairs signally illustrates the sound sense of those who last year urged the bold exercise of the royal prerogative. A general election was the consequence of the "new" constitution of the House of Commons. Many months intervened between the Royal assent to the Reform Bills, and the dissolution of Parliament. The preceding excitement of the public mind had altogether subsided. The Ministry had given no pledges of any very extensive reforms; indeed the *ultra-Reformers* did not view the Government with any great favour. The declarations of Lord Althorp and Mr. Stanley on the hustings savoured of anything but extreme movement. The political unions exercised no influence over the elections. The "Conservatives" never made greater exertions to secure returns, and their last farthing was expended in the cause of influence and corruption. They were signally defeated; *four-fifths* of the successful candidates were men of *decided liberal opinions*, and yet we will boldly assert that the present House of Commons, in respect of *property* and political opinion, is the most moderate and "Conservative" assembly that will ever be chosen under the present system of representation. The general measures of the cabinet have been confessedly formed on moderate principles, and with relation to the hostile character of the Upper House. The unfortunate state of Ireland—caused by Tory misgovernment—and the still more unfortunate coercive measures deemed necessary by the executive, added to the limited nature of the retrenchments and popular measures introduced by Ministers, have undoubtedly reduced their popularity, and *unsettled them* in public opinion. We do not now discuss the ministerial policy; we do not defend it, but we are persuaded that the majority of the constituency of the kingdom will duly allow for the unexampled difficulties of their situation, and will not deny that many *most important*

reforms are in progress. We are equally sure that the electoral body would not exchange the Whigs for the Tories, whatever might be the *artful promises* of the latter. But, notwithstanding the conservatism of the cabinet measures, Ministers are yet too liberal for the Tory aristocracy, and the "Conservatives" are plotting their downfall to counteract even such moderate reforms! The "stand" is to be made on the Irish Church Bill, and the Tory Peers are again, it seems, to *join issue with the people!* The Conservatives build their hopes on his Majesty—that the King will accept the consequent resignation of Lord Grey, or refuse him the means of governing the country, by adjusting the Peerage. They even affect to be anxious to dissolve the Parliament, or vainly expect by the demonstration of a dissolution to tongue-tie and fetter the reformed House of Commons. Both projects must inevitably fail. We do not believe that they *dare dissolve the House of Commons.* Sir Joseph Surface, safe in his "family seat," might affect to brave "the battle and the storm;" but he well knows that even his art and finished Parliamentary rhetoric could not "manage" or "lead" the elected assembly. Since the passing of the Reform Bills, he has often boasted at public dinners (exclusively partaken of by his political friends) that he is "born of himself"—descended from one of the people; but this will not succeed; he knows that his present politic and equi-distant position between all parties is dependent on situation *out of office*, and that in office the nominal premier of the Duke of Wellington would not have a bed of roses for his couch. But if the Conservatives, acting on their self-deceit and hungry craving after their old offices, should madly seize the reins of power, their tenure will be that of Phaeton; and final and fatal will be their fall. Their flat-catchers give out they will *repeal the house and window taxes* and that they will be "Radicals in office." Their projects and propositions are preposterous. They cannot by any back-water streams turn the current of reform. They cannot preserve the *abuses of the English or the Irish churches*; they cannot deprive us of popular municipal institutions; they cannot again wallow undisturbed in *useless places*, or *repossess themselves of scandalous sinecures and pensions.* They may and will produce a dreadful revolution, but they will be its first and most devoted sacrifice; and we believe that in their present desperation they would pull down on themselves the pillars of the temple of the constitution if they could but make its ruins the common grave of their party enemies.

"What will not ambition and revenge descend to!"

We understand that the Tories waver in their courage, and that they prefer their old tactics of "political mutilation." We would advise the well-meaning but mistaken part of the aristocracy, privy to these cabals, to take a

sober view of their perilous situation. They are just awake from their last delusion, and the blighted hope of casting out the Reform Bills and their authors. They yet painfully remember their abdication in the House of Lords. Lord Wharncliffe did not scruple to declare, this time last year, that "the vote of the House of Lords was *overborne by the people* and by the House of Commons: *force was put upon them; they were deprived of their independence, and a farce.*" The Tory aristocracy, at that momentous period, preferred to surrender their legislative privileges rather than admit new partners in their noble firm. Happy was it that the *existence* of the royal prerogative accomplished its effect without the exercise of the power of creating peers. The Duke of Wellington declared that the old constitution was at an end. He spoke truly, and fortunate will it be for his "Order" if he retains the opinions. The *Examiner* and the *Spectator* of yesterday, will show them that the vital question of an hereditary Peerage is raised by their insane conduct, and the mere rumour of a collision between the two branches of the legislature. Montesquieu, we think, called the British constitution "a masked Republic," and now the mask has been lifted up, his Grace would do well to contemplate its actual visage. The liberal press is accused of endeavouring to influence the King. Who were the best and most loyal friends of his Majesty in May twelvemonth—the *Liberals*, who truly warned him of the state and certain effect of public opinion; or the crawling courtiers, the royal, and courtesy relatives who invaded the royal presence? Abuse the Sovereign, forsooth! Why it is, notorious that the Carlton Club, on the recent return of Ministers from Windsor, and at this very moment, vomit out the most vulgar and virulent abuse of his Majesty. The Tory clubbists dread the sagacity and resolution of the King, and in their hearts they equally detest his patriotic character. They wisely fear that the King will not sanction projected ministerial changes, which would derange and delay the settlement of the great commercial questions now before the House of Commons; that he will not plough up the public mind by fresh appeals to the constituency—that he will not "put the rudder about," and tack from one side of the political channel to another; that he will steer a middle course, and in this tempestuous state of the political ocean, will prove too good a pilot to sink the vessel of the state by running her on the breakers of party. We cannot believe that the King will leave the people to manage alone their contest with the Tory aristocracy. But, whatever the issue of this cabal, we possess the *sheet-anchor* of a reformed House of Commons. The two estates of the realm in the most determined coalition could not cramp YOUNG HERCULES in the cradle.

(From the Morning Chronicle of the 18th instant.)

The Lords appeared disposed last night to profit by our advice. A *whip* had been conti-

ed up to the hour of the House meeting, either the admonition of the Lord Chancellor, who opened his speech introducing the Local Courts' Bill, with an exordium which must have produced a wholesome effect, or an unanswerable and cutting reply to Lord Lyndhurst, or, as we have before said, the humble advice which we have ventured to offer to their Lordships, deterred them from going to a division, and repeating their blunder on the Portuguese question. To whatever cause their more considerate course is to be ascribed, we hail it as the possible precursor of more rational conduct. We hear also, that many of the old and obtuse Tories cannot be persuaded that any advantage can arise to their order from bringing about a collision, which the desperate and factious intriguers of the Carlton Club are driving at to repair their fortunes. They have inquired, it is said of Sir Robert Peel, what his ideas and prospects are of the formation and success of an Administration to conduct the Government on Tory principles. His answers are reported as evasive and ambiguous. The consequence has been a division in the Carlton camp, which may not be easily healed, or in time to secure a united opposition to the Irish Church Bill. Still, these are rather symptoms of the temporary abatement of the disease, than of its cure; and the nation has no security that the Government may not be destroyed by some fit of faction or caprice breaking out when least expected. We regret to hear that his Majesty dines with the Duke of Wellington to-day. On an ordinary occasion, none of his subjects could object to his celebrating with his successful general the anniversary of Waterloo. But why is this particular moment, and this year, contrary to his Majesty's practice on former ones, selected for this compliment to the leader of the opposition? If it is done under the advice of his Ministers—and, more or less, these marked movements of the court should be advised by his Ministers—they are either the most drivelling of all imbeciles, or traitors to the House of Commons and the public. We have never doubted—we do not doubt—the strict honour and honesty of the King. We have the worst opinion of the society which infests his court. The people exclaim in all quarters—What can Lord Grey expect from submitting to the formal reception of his most inveterate opponents, to the exclusion of his best friends? During the Ascot week—we believe on the very night of the division on the Duke's motion—several of his Majesty's guests came up, or sent their proxies, for the express purpose of overturning the Government, and returned to a most gracious reception at the Castle. All this is not trifling. Will those who have access to his Majesty report faithfully to him the sensation produced in the city, within the last three days, by the threatened difference between the Houses of Parliament? The stocks have fallen, with every appearance of a continuance of the present alarm leading to a panic; and

we are satisfied that if the Lords had, in the exercise of their power and discretion, thrown out the Chancellor's bill last night, a greater impression would have been produced on the funds. And what particular moment is selected for this movement? When the West India question, the East India question, and the Bank Charter, are in progress of settlement; and when the prevailing distress in some of the manufacturing districts is fast giving way to increased activity in trade, and occupation for the industrious population! And are all these great interests to be put in jeopardy, or to be sacrificed, for the gratification of the feelings of disappointment and revenge of an overbearing aristocracy? That they never can forget the Reform Bill, or forgive its authors, we know perfectly well; but we entreat them to reflect on the necessary injuries entailed by their insane proceedings on the more valuable masses of society; and if that should have no influence on their decision, upon the certain and irretrievable ruin which must follow to themselves and their families. If we cannot touch their better feelings, we invoke their selfish ones, to protect the country from a crisis.

After all, it must be made clear that the Government act their part with resolution and vigour. They may go out to-morrow; but if their retirement from office is created by weakness and vacillation, their services in the Reform Bill will scarcely protect them from public odium. We hope there has been no irresolution in tendering advice to the Crown as to the fit course to be pursued towards some persons who think it consistent with their honour and the character of their station to stoop to the meanness of sharing in the hospitalities of the Court whilst they are plotting against his Majesty's Government and his best interests.

The infatuation of the more disinterested portion of the Tory Peers, seduced into the present cabal against the Ministry, is inexplicable, if we did not know the blindness of political prejudice. *The hungry and reckless paupers raised to the Peerage by the Pitt and Castlereagh administrations*—men whose sole dependence existed in the *pillage of the nation*—of course covet office at any risk, and would despise no mode of attaining its sweets. In their minds, any means sanctify ends essential to their interests. But it is passing strange that any portion of the old aristocracy should allow itself to be made the tools of such a miserable and necessitous faction. The great majority of the Tory place-hunters have no other hope or means of keeping *caste*, and they are pushed on by their still more needy dependants and ex-official secretaries. The Tory Lords of real nobility and competent estate might reflect on the madness of their conduct, ere they wildly precipitate themselves into the gulf of political destruction. Can they blind themselves to the palpable ascendancy of the popular power throughout Europe and its inevitable supremacy? Can

they not discern that a violation of the spirit of the age has invariably been followed by political self-destruction? We again entreat them to reflect on the folly and blindness of their recent opposition to Parliamentary Reform, and its severe disappointment of their predictions. The nation is just beginning to revive from the extraordinary excitement of the last three years. Ministers are *gradually adjusting* the great commercial interests which have been so long depressed and neglected. *If the Tories come into power, all these great national questions will be sacrificed for a considerable period.* The Conservatives allege that the Whig cabinet is unpopular from the moderate character of its measures. Against all those measures they have set themselves in hostile array, and yet they are intriguing for the support of the ultra-radicals! A more preposterous design cannot be imagined; and, whatever might be the present harmony of these political coquettes, they could not fail to be in bitter warfare before the expiration of three months. They are spreading a little bird-line for the ultra-radicals, and hope to catch them by an artful declaration that *they will reduce taxation*; but we think that they might pause before they ratify such an unnatural coalition, and see cause of no common suspicion when they observe Mr. Cobbett angling with the same fly. When that acute politician turns huntsman of a Tory pack, lauds the hostility of the Peers to Earl Grey, and offers up prayers for a Tory Government, he can only be digging a *pit-fall for Conservative credulity.* In fact, the two extreme parties are vainly endeavouring to outwit each other, and both will be deceived in their expectations. In the meanwhile, the constituency and the House of Commons will save the country; if the bold Duke of Wellington dissolved the Parliament, he would get a task-master from whom he would soon run away; if he attempted to march with the existing Parliament, he will soon be left behind. But we cannot believe that the King will allow the Tory aristocracy to commit suicide; certain we are that the electors of the united kingdom would again *speedily couch the eyes* of the Duke of Wellington. His Lordship's partisans already begin to desert his standard, and the cabal will turn out a meal-tub plot.

FIELD SEEDS.

TO BE HAD AT BOLT-COURT,
FLEET-STREET.

SWEDISH TURNIP SEED.—Any quantity under 10lbs. 9d. a pound; and any quantity above 10lbs. and under 50lbs. 8d. a pound; any quantity above 50lbs. 8d. a pound; above 100lbs. 7d. A parcel of seed may be sent to any part of the kingdom; I will find proper

bags, will send it to any coach or van or wagon, and have it booked at my expense; but *the money must be paid at my shop before the seed be sent away*; in consideration of which I have made due allowance in the price. If the quantity be small, any friend can call and get it for a friend in the country; if the quantity be large, it may be sent by me.

MANGEL WURZEL SEED.—Any quantity under 10lbs., 8d. a pound; any quantity above 10lbs. and under 50lbs., 7d. a pound; any quantity above 50lbs., 6d. a pound; any quantity above 100lbs., 6d. a pound. The selling at the same place as above; the payment in the same manner.

TREE SEED.

LOCUST SEED.—6s. a pound.

From the LONDON GAZETTE,

FRIDAY, JUNE 14, 1833.

INSOLVENTS.

DELEMAIN, W., Wells-street, Marylebone, wine-merchant.
HILL, B., Oxford, hatter.
TYLER, M., Lycombe, Somersetshire, retail-brewer.

BANKRUPTS.

COOPER, T., Brighton, hotel-keeper.
FLETCHER, H., Finsbury-place, bookseller.
GRAY, J., Chichester, clothes-salesman.
JARVIS, W., Truro, innkeeper.
JONES, F., Cornhill, silversmith.
PASMORE, E., Maidenhead, grocer.
ROUND, J., Stourbridge, Worcestershire, plumber.
SHEPHERD, S., Upper Bryanston-street, Portman-square, wine-merchant.

TUESDAY, JUNE 18, 1833.

INSOLVENT.

LEDWARD, E., Liverpool, hat-manufacturer.

BANKRUPTCY SUPERSEDED.

PARKER, W., Leeds, grocer.

BANKRUPTS.

ALLURED, W., Liverpool, tailor.
COX, S. M., Exeter, scrivener.

EAST, P., Tavistock-street, Covent-garden, bookseller.
 HULL, W., Coventry, watch-manufacturer.
 LAW, B., Northampton, biscuit baker.
 LONGMIRE, G., Barnard Castle, Durham, draper.
 MOTT, W. R., Throgmorton-street, hotel-keeper.
 PAYNTER, J. W., Manchester, dealer and chapman.
 POWELL, P., Brighton, lace-merchant.
 RICHARDSON, J. C., J. and R., Manchester, commission-agents.
 ROLFES, W. G., Fenchurch-street, tobacco-broker.
 SHEASBY, S., High Holborn, furnishing-ironmonger.

LONDON MARKETS.

MARK-LANE, CORN-EXCHANGE, JUNE 17.—The supplies of Wheat fresh up to this morning's market from the home counties were moderate. All the better descriptions moved freely off hand at an advance of 2s. per qr. on the rates of this day week, and secondary descriptions were 1s. dearer, but stale samples, and those out of condition, experienced no improvement and were difficult to quit. Old Wheat remained firm at former quotations. Some inquiry existed for banded Corn, and Danzig qualities obtained 42s. to 45s., and Kubanka 32s. The advance in Wheat is partially to be attributed to the reports received from the country, particularly from the West of England, respecting the damage the growing crops have sustained from the late gales.

The showery weather we are experiencing has checked the speculative spirit for Barley, and although prices are nominally the same, yet the demand was very limited.

Malt was very dull sale at former prices.

The same causes which have operated with speculators regarding Barley are applicable to the article of Oats, and which, added to an extensive supply, has rendered the trade dull, and prices have declined full 1s. per qr. on all descriptions.

Beans were in very short supply, and 1s. dearer.

Peas continue scarce, and if at market would realize more money.

The advance that has taken place in Wheat would, it was anticipated, have induced millers to endeavour to raise the price of Flour 5s. per sack, and although in the early part of the market the subject was canvassed, yet at the close Flour remained stationary at former prices. Ship Flour, however, was 1s. to 2s. per sack dearer, and Irish fine is saleable at 42s.

Wheat	54s. to 61s.
Rye	32s. to 34s.
Barley	21s. to 23s.
— fine,	28s. to 31s.

Peas, White	30s. to 32s.
— Boilers	36s. to —s.
— Grey	28s. to 29s.
Beans, Small	—s. to —s.
— Tick	27s. to 29s.
Oats, Potato	22s. to 23s.
— Feed	14s. to 15s.
Flour, per sack	46s. to 50s.

PROVISIONS.

Pork, India, new	110s. to 115s. 6a.
— Mess, new ...	60s. to 63s. per barl.
Butter, Belfast ...	62s. to —s. per cwt.
— Carlow	54s. to 65s.
— Cork	64s. to 66s.
— Limerick ..	64s. to 66s.
— Waterford ..	50s. to 56s.
— Dublin	50s. to —s.

SMITHFIELD.—June 17.

This day's supply of Beasts, Sheep, Lambs, and Calves, was, for the time of year, exceedingly good, both as to numbers and quality; the supply of Porkers, limited. Trade was, throughout, dull. With prime small Beef, Mutton, and Veal at an advance of 2d. per stone; with larger kinds, as also Lamb and Pork, at Friday's quotations.

Full three-fourths of the beasts were Scots, interspersed with a few Norfolk homebreds; about an eighth short-horns; and the remaining eighth about equal numbers of Welsh runts, Herefords, Devons, Sussex, and Irish beasts, chiefly (say about 2,200 of them) from Norfolk, with a few from Suffolk, Essex, Kent, Sussex, Surrey, Lincolnshire, Leicestershire, and our western and midland districts; with about 50 Town's-end Cows, a few Staffords, &c., chiefly from the London marshes, &c.

Full three-fourths of the Sheep appeared to be new Leicesters of the South Down and white-faced crosses, in the proportion of about two of the former to five of the latter; about an eighth South Downs and the remaining eighth about equal numbers of polled Norfolks, Kents, and Kentish half-breds, with a few old Leicester and Lincolns, horned Norfolks, Somersets, and Dorsets; horned and polled Scotch and Welsh Sheep, &c. About a moiety of the Lambs appeared to be new Leicesters, for the most part of the South Down cross; and the remainder about equal numbers of South Downs, Dorsets, and Kentish half-breds.]

MARK-LANE.—Friday, June 21.

The arrivals are moderate. The prices the same as on Monday.

THE FUNDS.

Consols for Account, .89½.

COBBETT-LIBRARY.

*New Edition.***COBBETT'S Spelling-Book***(Price 2s.)*

Containing, besides all the usual matter of such a book, a clear and concise

INTRODUCTION TO ENGLISH GRAMMAR.

This I have written by way of

A Stepping-Stone to my own Grammar;

such a thing having been frequently suggested to me by Teachers as necessary.

1. ENGLISH GRAMMAR.—Of this work sixty thousand copies have now been published. This is a duodecimo volume, and the price is 3s. bound in boards.

2. An ITALIAN GRAMMAR, by Mr. JAMES PAUL COBBETT.—Being a Plain and Compendious Introduction to the Study of Italian. Price 6s.

3. TULL'S HORSE-HOEING HUSBANDRY; or, a Treatise on the Principles of Tillage and Vegetation. With an Introduction, by WM. COBBETT. 8vo. Price 15s.

4. THE EMIGRANT'S GUIDE. Just now Published, under this Title, a little Volume, containing Ten Letters, addressed to English Tax-payers. A new edition, with a Postscript, containing an account of the Prices of Houses and Land, recently obtained from America by Mr. Cobbett. Price 2s. 6d. in bds.

6. THE WOODLANDS; or, a Treatise on the preparing of the ground for planting; on the planting, on the cultivating, on the pruning, and on the cutting down, of Forest Trees and Underwoods. Price 14s. bound in boards.

7. YEAR'S RESIDENCE IN AMERICA.—The Price of this book, in good print and on fine paper, is 5s.

8. FRENCH GRAMMAR; or, Plain Instructions for the Learning of French. Price, bound in boards, 5s.

9. COTTAGE ECONOMY.—I wrote this Work professedly for the use of the labouring and middling classes of the English nation. I made myself acquainted with the best and simplest modes of making beer and bread, and these I made it as plain as, I believe, words could make it. Also of the keeping of Cows, Pigs, Bees, and Poultry, matters which I understood as well as any body could, and in all their details. It includes my writings also on the Straw Plait. A Duodecimo Volume. Price 2s. 6d.

10. POOR MAN'S FRIEND. A new edition. Price 8d.

11. THE LAW OF TURNPIKES. By William Cobbett, Jun., Student of Lincoln's Inn. Price 3s. 6d. boards.

12. ROMAN HISTORY, French and English, intended, not only as a History for Young People to read, but as a Book of Exercises to accompany my French Grammar. Two Volumes. Price 13s. in boards.

13. PAPER AGAINST GOLD; or, the History and Mystery of the National Debt, the Bank of England, the Funds, and all the Trickery of Paper Money. The Price of this book, very nicely printed, is 5s.

14. MARTENS'S LAW OF NATIONS.—This is the Book which was the foundation of all the knowledge that I have ever possessed relative to public law. The Price is 17s., and the manner of its execution is I think, such as to make it fit for the Library of any Gentleman.

15. MR. JAMES PAUL COBBETT'S RIDE OF EIGHT HUNDRED MILES IN FRANCE. Second Edition. Price 2s. 6d.

16. SERMONS.—There are twelve of these, in one volume, on the following subjects: 1. Hypocrisy and Cruelty; 2. Drunkenness; 3. Bribery; 4. Oppression; 5. Unjust Judges; 6. The Sluggard; 7. The Murderer; 8. The Gamester; 9. Public Robbery; 10. The Unnatural Mother; 11. The Sin of Forbidding Marriage; 12. On the Duties of Parsons, and on the Institution and Object of Tithes. Price 3s. 6d. bound in boards.

A Thirteenth Sermon, entitled "GOOD FRIDAY; or, The Murder of Jesus Christ by the Jews." Price 6d.

17. LETTERS FROM FRANCE: containing Observations made in that Country during a Residence of Two Months in the South, and Three Months at Paris. By JOHN M. COBBETT. Price 4s. in boards.

18. A TREATISE ON COBBETT'S CORN; containing Instructions for Propagating and Cultivating the Plant, and for Harvesting and Preserving the Crop; and also an account of the several uses to which the Produce is applied. Price 2s. 6d.

19. PROTESTANT "REFORMATION" in England and Ireland, showing how that event has impoverished and degraded the main body of the people in those countries. Two volumes, bound in boards. The Price of the first volume is 4s. 6d. The Price of the second volume 3s. 6d.

Just published, price 6s. a new edition of the

ENGLISH GARDENER,

OR,

A TREATISE

On the Situation, Soil, Enclosing and Laying-Out of Kitchen Gardens; on the Making and Managing of Hot-beds and Green-Houses; and on the Propagation and Cultivation of all sorts of Kitchen-Garden Plants, and of Fruit-Trees whether of the Garden or the Orchard.

AND ALSO,

On the Formation of Shrubberies and Flower-Gardens; and on the Propagation and Cultivation of the several sorts of Shrubs and Flowers;

CONCLUDING WITH

A KALENDAR,

Giving instructions relative to the Sowings, Plantings, Prunings, and other labours, to be performed in the Gardens, in each Month of the Year.

By WILLIAM COBBETT.

Was Published on the 1. of June,

Price Two Shillings,

COBBETT'S MAGAZINE; a Monthly Review of Politics, History, Science, Literature, Arts, &c. &c. The Contents of the Number are as follows:—Ireland, Grand Jury Bill.—Fine Arts—The Royal Academy Exhibition.—Second Exhibition of the Associated Painters in Water-colours.—Song.—The Wagon.—Lord Collingwood.—Corporate Reform.—Lines written at the Tomb of a Young Lady.—Duelling.—My Old Regiment.—The Whigs and Sir John Hobhouse.—The "National Convention" Meeting.—Lines to a Lost Friend.—Events of the Month.—Critical Notices, &c.

Published at No. 11, Bolt-court, Fleet-street; and by Effingham Wilson, Royal Exchange. To be had of all Newsmen and Booksellers throughout the country.

N.B. The second edition of No. I. is just published.

Just published, price 12s.

A GEOGRAPHICAL DICTIONARY OF ENGLAND AND WALES;

CONTAINING

The names, in Alphabetical Order, of all the Counties, with their several Subdivisions, into Hundreds, Lathes, Rapes, Wapentakes, Wards, or Divisions; and an Account of the Distribution of the Counties

into Circuits, Dioceses, and Parliamentary Divisions.

ALSO,

The names (under that of each County respectively), in Alphabetical Order, of all the Cities, Boroughs, Market Towns, Villages, Hamlets, and Tithings, with the Distance of each from London, or from the nearest Market Town, and with the Population, and other interesting particulars relating to each; besides which there are

MAPS;

First, one of the whole country, showing the local situation of the Counties relatively to each other; and, then, each County is also preceded by a Map, showing, in the same manner, the local situation of the Cities, Boroughs, and Market Towns.

FOUR TABLES

Are added; first, a Statistical Table of all the Counties, and then three Tables, showing the new Divisions and Distributions enacted by the Reform-Law of 4th June, 1832.

JOURNAL

OF

A TOUR IN ITALY,

AND ALSO IN PART OF

FRANCE AND SWITZERLAND;

The route being

From Paris, through Lyons, to Marseilles, and, thence, to Nice, Genoa, Pisa, Florence, Rome, Naples, and Mount Vesuvius;

AND

By Rome, Terni, Perugia, Arezzo, Florence, Bologna, Ferrara, Padua, Venice, Verona, Milan, over the Alps by Mount St. Bernard, Geneva, and the Jura, back into France;

The space of time being,

From October 1828, to September 1829.

CONTAINING

A description of the country, of the principal cities and their most striking curiosities; of the climate, soil, agriculture, horticulture, and products; of the prices of provisions and labour; and of the dresses and conditions of the people;

AND ALSO

An account of the laws and customs, civil and religious, and of the morals and demeanour of the inhabitants, in the several States.

By JAMES P. COBBETT.

PATENT BRANDY *versus* PREJUDICE.

J. T. BETTS and Co. had flattered themselves that the unprecedented extent of sale and admitted superiority in the quality of their PATENT FRENCH DISTILLED BRANDY would, ere now, have wholly dissipated the prejudice which have been known to exist in the minds of many persons against Brandy manufactured in this country, and which, before the introduction of their article, was, perhaps, justifiable. If a patronage, as distinguished as it is extensive, including many thousand families of every rank and class of society in all parts of the kingdom, be any proof of merit, then has the PATENT BRANDY irresistible claims to universal support.

J. T. BETTS and Co. could well have afforded to rest their claims to the merit of having introduced an unrivalled production on such incontrovertible evidence; but they feel that the public, rather than themselves, are interested in the announcement, that they are perfectly aware of the efforts still made by interested persons to depreciate the PATENT BRANDY; and to prevent the entire removal from the public mind of that injurious delusion, which, however weakened, still exists in a qualified degree. It is mainly with a view, therefore, to destroy the last remnant of this prejudice, that J. T. BETTS and Co. recall the attention of all classes to the consideration of the decided approval given by the faculty to their PATENT BRANDY—an approbation resting on the important facts contained in the following detail:

First—That “BETTS’ PATENT FRENCH DISTILLED BRANDY” is the only known pure Spirit in the World.

Secondly—That the dealers in French Brandy—who have always been the most inveterate, as they are the natural opponents of the PATENT BRANDY—have been repeatedly challenged in the public journals, by comparison or otherwise, to disprove the foregoing fact; and as the vital interests of their trade hang upon its disproof, the sole and just inference drawn by the public, from their constantly declining to accept the challenge, is, that THE FACT IS BEYOND DISPUTE.

Thirdly—That, whilst the PATENT BRANDY possesses all the valuable properties of the first class Cognac, it is free from the acids which even that fine spirit is known to contain. Its superiority is still more marked over French Brandies of the second and lower classes, which are frequently mixed with considerable quantities of a spirit obtained from other products than the grape, containing a large proportion of acids, which tends seriously to disorder the stomach.

Fourthly—That, in consequence of the freedom of the PATENT BRANDY from those injurious acids, its use is not attended with nausea or headach. And, as a necessary consequence of its extreme purity, it is found congenial to the most delicate constitutions,

and is especially valuable to persons of bilious or dyspeptic habits.

Fifthly—That, for the foregoing reasons, all the faculty, who are acquainted with the intrinsic merits of the PATENT BRANDY, recommend it in preference to any other spirit for medicinal purposes.

Sixthly—That, for the like reasons, when used as an ordinary beverage, diluted (in the manner recommended by the first Physicians) in the proportion of one to six, it is infinitely preferable to Malt, and other fermentable liquors. Whilst it stands unrivalled for HOME-MADE WINES, CONFECTIONARY and CULINARY purposes, where the absence of acids is an important requisite.

Seventhly—That the PATENT BRANDY, either PALE or COLOURED, at the highest legal strength, is charged only EIGHTEEN SHILLINGS per Imperial Gallon, or little more than half the price of French Brandy.

And lastly—That the superiority of the PATENT BRANDY, as thus defined, is established by unanimous opinions, founded upon the results of various analyses made by the most celebrated Chemists; from whose certificates the three accompanying extracts are selected.

EXTRACTS FROM THE TESTIMONIALS.

“Your Brandy is free from uncombined acid and astringent matter, which exists more or less in most of the Brandies imported from France.

“JOHN THOMAS COOPER,
Lecturer on Chemistry.”

“To Mr. Betts.”

“I am bound to say, and do assert it with confidence, that for purity of spirit this cannot be surpassed, and that your Patent Brandy is also quite free from those acids which, though minute in quantity, always contaminate the foreign spirit.

“JOSEPH HUME,
Chemist to his Majesty.”

“J. T. Betts, Esq.”

“I do not hesitate to express my conviction that your Patent Brandy is fully as free from everything injurious to health, and contains as pure a spirit, as the best varieties of Foreign Brandy.

“EDWARD TURNER,
Professor of Chemistry in the University
of London.”

“John T. Betts, Esq.”

J. T. BETTS and Co. deem it expedient to caution the Public against the many spurious imitations which abound both in Town and Country; and in consequence of the name of their Distillery having been pirated, it is further necessary to state, that their only Establishment is at No. 7, Smithfield Bars (leading to St. John Street), where orders for Two Gallons and upwards will be promptly executed for Cash on delivery.

••• A liberal discount to the Trade.

Printed by William Cobbett, Johnson's-court: and published by him, at 11, Bolt-court, Fleet-street.